

Appendix C.

Statistical Methodology

MAIL LIST MODEL

Classification analysis was performed to predict the probability that an addressee on the 1992 mail list operated a farm, and thereby separated the preliminary mail list into probable farm and probable nonfarm classes. The analysis was used to reduce the preliminary census mail list of 3.78 million records to a final mail list size of 3.55 million records. All 3.55 million addresses on the final mail list received a census of agriculture report form.

Records from the 1987 final census mail list were used to build a 1992 prediction model for the 1992 analysis. Classification and Regression Trees (CART) software analyzed characteristics of known 1987 farm and nonfarm operations to determine which were most useful in predicting farm and nonfarm classes. Record characteristics such as the source of the mail list record, number of source lists on which the record appeared, expected value of agricultural sales, and geographic location were used to separate mail list records into model groups. (Sources included the previous agriculture census mail list, the Internal Revenue Service administrative records, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and special commodity lists.) The proportion of 1987 census farm records in each model group was calculated to provide an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

After the model groups were defined, each address record on the 1992 preliminary mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms according to the classification tree methodology. The model, followed by analyst reviews, was used to remove 229,700 records from the preliminary mail list (those in model groups with the lowest farm probability), and thereby designated the 3.55 million records with the highest farm probability to receive the census report form. This procedure was used to obtain a more complete census enumeration of farm operations without excessive respondent burden and data collection cost.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

Each of the 3.55 million name and address records on the census mail list was designated to receive one of three different types of census report forms. The three forms were the nonsample form, the screener form, and the

sample form. Sections 1 through 20 and 27 through 32 of the sample form are identical to sections on the nonsample form. The sample form, sections 21 through 26, contains additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income. The screener form is identical to the nonsample form with questions added in section 1 to allow quick identification of nonfarm addresses. These three different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island, and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Addresses were selected into the sample with certainty (1) if they were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) if they were multiunit operations (i.e., separate farms in more than one location), (3) if they had other special characteristics, or (4) if they were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1987. Other addresses in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2, and other addresses in counties containing 200 farms or more in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties. When a nonsample large farm was identified during processing, a supplemental form that contained the additional sample data inquiries was mailed.

To determine which mail list records would receive the screener form, all mail list records not designated for the sample were sorted by model group farm probability as specified by the mail list model. The 412,000 mail list records in the model groups with the lowest probability of being farms and with an expected total value of agricultural product sales less than \$25,000 were designated to receive the screener report form. The remaining mail list records received the nonsample report form.

CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1992 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures. These estimation procedures accounted for nonresponse to the data collection and for the sample data collection. These procedures are necessary because some farm operators never respond to

the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and the estimates for the sample data are based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

A statistical estimation procedure was used to account for nonrespondent farm operators to the census. We excluded large and unique farm operations that received intensive telephone followup during census processing, assuming complete response from them. A stratified systematic sample of remaining census nonrespondents were contacted by enumerators using a computer-assisted telephone interview system. Five sample strata were defined based on expected value of sales, previous census status, and whether the record was identified by the mail list model to receive the screener report form. The nonresponse survey telephone interview was designed to provide sufficient information to determine the farm status of each record.

In situations where the nonresponse survey case could not be contacted, the contact person refused to cooperate, or when no phone number could be obtained, a screener report form was sent by certified mail.

Estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents that operated farms were made for each stratum in the State using survey results and applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms for each county by stratum was then derived. This estimation procedure is based on the assumption that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county is the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Certain census respondent farms which exhibited "rare" commodities were designated as "ineligible" to represent census nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting operation. The procedure explained below was performed with only the eligible respondent cases: Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. The noninteger nonresponse weight is the ratio of the sum of the estimated number of nonrespondent farms from the nonresponse survey and the number of eligible census respondent farms to the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight was never greater than 2.0. The noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final weight for the sample items. The noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record for tabulating the complete count items for publication.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in these tables are the percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided

in these tables do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of item nonresponse is discussed in the Census Nonsampling Error section.

Table A. Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1992

Item	Percent of total
Farms	14.3
Land in farms.....acres	8.9
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹\$1,000	4.4
Market value of agricultural products sold ..\$1,000	7.0
Harvested croplandacres	8.4
Corn for grain or seedacres	8.0
Wheat for grainacres	10.5
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calvesnumber	9.2
Hogs and pigsnumber	5.8
Hens and pullets of laying agenumber9

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimates the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. The estimates were obtained from a ratio estimation procedure that resulted in the assignment of a weight to each respondent record containing sample items. For any given county, a sample item total was estimated by multiplying the data items for each farm in the county by the corresponding sample weight and summing over all sample records in the county.

Each respondent sample farm was assigned a sample weight for use in producing estimates for all sample items. For example, if the weight given to a sample farm had the value 6, all sample data items reported by that farm would be multiplied by 6. The weight assigned to a sample certainty farm was 1.

Other than certainty farms, within a county, the ratio estimation procedure for farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1992 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. Both the second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were as follows:

TVP	SIC	Acres
\$1 to \$999	01 All crops	1 to 69
\$1,000 to \$2,499	02 All livestock	70 or more
\$2,500 to \$4,999		
\$5,000 to \$9,999		
\$10,000 to \$24,999		
\$25,000 to \$49,999		
\$50,000 to \$99,999		
\$100,000 or more		

The first step in the estimation procedure was to classify the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial post strata formed by the three sets of groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample weight equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This weight was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure was to combine, if necessary, the 32 initial post strata to increase the reliability of the ratio estimation procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms after nonresponse adjustment or had a weight greater than two times the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2 or 6, depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2 or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the initial 32 post strata according to a specified collapsing pattern. After the collapsing process was completed, new total farm counts and sample farm counts were computed from each of the final post strata and were used to calculate final sample weights.

The final step consisted of assigning the noninteger final post stratum weight to the sample farm records in each post stratum. The weight is the ratio of total farm count to sample farm count in each final post stratum. The noninteger sample weight, the product of the noninteger final post stratum weight and the nonresponse weight, was randomly rounded to an integer weight for tabulation. If, for example, the final weight for the farms in a particular post stratum was 7.2, then 0.2 or one-fifth of the sample farms in this post stratum were randomly assigned a weight of 8 and the remaining four-fifths received a weight of 7.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1992 Census of Agriculture is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Sample refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive the sample report forms. Estimates derived from all the possible samples would differ from each other only by random variation.

The standard error or sampling error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and thus is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as 100 times the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples were surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error were calculated from each sample, then:

1. Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.
2. Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary for producing a confidence interval for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is .1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94). If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the figure obtained from a complete enumeration. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

Census items were classified as either complete count or sample count items. Complete count items were asked of all farm operators. Examples of complete count items were land in farms, harvested cropland, livestock inventory and sales, crop acreage, quantities harvested and crop sales, land use, irrigation, government loans and payments, conservation acreage, type of organization, and operator characteristics.

Sample count items were asked only of a sample of farm operators. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: commercial fertilizers, chemicals, production expenses, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income.

Variability, measured as percent relative standard error, in the estimates of complete count items is due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. Variability in the estimates of sample count items is due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Thus, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county reporting complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard error for estimated number of farms in a county reporting a complete count item and the bottom half a sample count item. These are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used for complete count items and sample count items. Each regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for all counties in the State. For sample count items, only data

from counties sampled at a rate of 1 in 6 are used in the estimation of the regression equation.

Table B. Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1992

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	6.3
50	4.4
75	3.6
100	3.1
150	2.5
200	2.1
300	1.7
500	1.2
750	.9
1,000	.6
1,500	.3
2,000	.2
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	27.6
50	21.7
75	19.3
100	18.0
150	16.6
200	15.8
300	15.0
500	14.4
750	14.0
1,000	13.9
1,500	13.7
2,000	13.6

To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. For counties with fewer than 100 farms in the 1987 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count item estimates comes only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures; thus, the estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Table C presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms, and table D presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms with sales of \$10,000 or more.

Table E presents the percent standard error for percent change in State totals from 1987 to 1992. The general

purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1992 and the 1987 estimate for that characteristic to the 1987 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The percent standard error of a percent change estimate, then, is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

Table F presents the percent relative standard error for State and county totals for selected data items. The percent relative standard error of the estimate for the same item differs among counties in the State. Reasons for this are differences among counties in (1) the total number of farms, (2) the number of large farms included with certainty, (3) the size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) the amount of nonresponse, (5) the general agricultural characteristics, and (6) the specific characteristic being measured.

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts are affected jointly by sampling errors, described in the previous section, and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures on specific operations. Nonsampling errors arise from incompleteness of the census mail list, duplication in the mail list, incorrect data reporting, errors in editing of reported data, and errors in imputation for missing data. These specific nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Evaluation studies will be conducted to measure the extent of certain nonsampling errors such as coverage error and classification error.

Census Coverage

The main objective of the census of agriculture is to obtain a complete and accurate enumeration of U.S. farms with accurate data on all aspects of the agricultural operation. However, the high cost and availability of resources for enumeration place restrictions on feasible data collection methodologies. The past six agriculture censuses have been conducted by mail enumeration with telephone contact for selected nonrespondents. The completeness of such an enumeration thus depends to a large extent on the coverage of farm operations by the census mail list.

The past five censuses of agriculture have included approximately 91 percent of farms in the United States and approximately 96 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of \$1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by fluctuations in agricultural operations qualifying for enumeration, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used

by an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, the accuracy of data reporting, and other factors. A new mail list is compiled for each census because no current single list of agricultural operations is comprehensive.

An evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture since 1945. The evaluation provides estimates of the completeness of census farm count and major census data items. In addition, the evaluation helps to identify problems in the census enumeration and provide information that can form the basis for improvements. The results of the 1992 Coverage Evaluation program will be published in volume 2, Subject Series (Part 2): Coverage Evaluation.

The evaluation of coverage for the 1992 census was designed to measure four components of error in the census mail list and in farm classification. Mail list error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms not on the census mail list (undercount) and a measurement of farms enumerated more than once in the census (overcount). Classification error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms classified as nonfarms in the census (undercount) and of nonfarms classified as farms in the census (overcount). Classification error arises from reporting and processing errors. Mail list undercount dominates all coverage errors. Net coverage error is defined as the difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. Measurements of these errors, as well as a description of the complete coverage program, will be available in the Coverage Evaluation report.

Mail List Coverage

A major problem with mail enumeration for the census of agriculture is the difficulty encountered in compiling a complete mail list. The percentage of farms included on the census mail list varies considerably by State. Several reasons have contributed to farm operator names not being included on the census mail list—the operation may have been started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any of the agriculture-related source lists used in compiling the census list, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout. A large proportion of the farms not included on the mail list are small in both acres and sales of agricultural products.

The 1992 Census of Agriculture Coverage Evaluation used the area segment sample of the 1992 June Agricultural Survey (JAS) of the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) to estimate farms not on the census mail list. The Census Bureau contracted with NASS to augment the JAS data collection. The survey data collected by NASS will be protected under the confidentiality of title 13, U.S. Code. These JAS survey records were matched to the census mail list. Records that did not match were mailed a census of agriculture report form to estimate mail list

coverage. Estimates of farms not on the census mail list are computed using a capture-recapture dual frame estimator which will be described in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Table G provides coverage evaluation estimates for one component of coverage error associated with the census of agriculture; that is, the error due to farms not on the census mail list. Also provided are estimates of selected characteristics of farms not on the mail list, estimates of characteristics of farms not on the mail list as a percentage of total farms in the State, and the percent relative standard error associated with each estimate. The estimate of total farms in the State is based on census farm count plus the estimated number of farms not on the census mail list. This estimate of total farms in the State was not adjusted for the components of error associated with classification and list duplication error. Estimates of these errors will be made at the regional, rather than the State level, and will be provided in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the mailed census report form or to the questions posed by a telephone enumerator introduce error into the census data. Such incorrect information can lead, in some cases, to incorrect classification of farms. This type of reporting error is measured by the Classification Error Survey discussed later in this section. To reduce all types of reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each addressee. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on tests of the census report form and each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency.

Item Nonresponse

As information flows from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses are identified on the report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the report form that logically should be present may create a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. When information from reporting farms is used to edit or impute for item nonresponse, the data may be biased due to characteristics of the nonreporting respondents differing from those reporting the item. Any attempt to correct the data items may not completely reflect this difference either at the element level (individual farm operation) or on the average.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each report form are sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. The processing of the report forms includes clerical screening for farm activity, computerized check-in of report forms and follow-up of nonrespondents, keying and transmittal of

completed report forms, computerized editing of inconsistent and missing data, review and correction of individual records referred from the computer edit, review and correction of tabulated data, and electronic data processing. These operations undergo a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible, yet some errors are not detected and corrected.

Classification Error

An evaluation study of classification errors was conducted in the 1992 Census of Agriculture as part of the census coverage evaluation program. A sample of census mail list respondents was selected, and these addresses were reenumerated to determine whether they were a farm or nonfarm. A farm status determination was made based on the evaluation report form and compared with the census farm status which was based on the data reported on the report form. Differences in status were reconciled.

In past censuses, the proportion of farms undercounted due to classification errors was higher for farms with small values of sales. For the 1987 census, the classification error rate was higher for (1) farms with small values of sales, (2) farms with a small number of acres, (3) full-owner farms than part-owner or tenant farms, (4) operators with principal occupation other than farming, and (5) males than females. Results from the 1992 Classification Error Survey will be published in the Coverage Evaluation report.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The Census of Agriculture Complex Edit and Imputation System performs the following functions:

- Ensuring reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, and combinations of commodities.
- Ensuring necessary consistencies are present. There are more than 70 distinct consistency requirements.
- Ensuring geographic, legal, and physical constraints are met.

The system must perform these and similar functions for 900 data keycodes for sample records and 850 data keycodes for nonsample records.

For the 1992 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

Whenever possible, edit imputations, deletions, and changes were based on component or related data on the respondent's report form. For some items, such as operator characteristics, data from the previous census were used when available. Values for other missing or unacceptable reported data items were calculated based on reported quantities and known price parameters.

When these and similar methods were not available and values had to be supplied, the imputation process used information reported for another farm operation in a geographically adjacent area with characteristics similar to those of the farm operation with incomplete data. For example, a farm operation that reported acres of corn harvested, but did not report quantity of corn harvested, was assigned the same bushels of corn per acre harvested as that of the last nearby farm with similar characteristics that reported acceptable yields during that particular execution of the computer edit. The imputation for missing items in each section of the report form was conducted separately; thus, assigned values for one operation could come from more than one respondent.

Prior to the imputation operation, a set of default values and relationships were assigned to the possible imputation variables. The relationships and values varied depending on the item being imputed. For example, different default values were assigned for several standard industrial classification and total value of sales categories when imputing hired farm labor expenses. These values and item relationships for the possible imputation variables were stored in the computer in a series of matrices.

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State. The computer records were sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for some sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions.

After the initial computer edit, keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data were keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for about 25 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy to ensure that the computer edit actions were correct. If the results of the computer edit were not acceptable, corrections were made and the record was reedited.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
F FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS						
Farms ----- number	77 610	.9				
Land in farms ----- acres	27 250	.6				
Average size of farm ----- acres	351	1.1				
M MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD						
Total sales (see text) ----- farms	77 610	.9				
\$1,000-----	7 336	.5				
Average per farm ----- dollars	94 535	1.0				
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than \$1,000 (see text) ----- farms	4 134	1.9				
\$1,000-----	1 292	2.1				
\$1,000 to \$2,499 ----- farms	5 044	1.8				
\$1,000-----	8 455	1.7				
\$2,500 to \$4,999 ----- farms	5 613	1.4				
\$1,000-----	20 268	1.4				
\$5,000 to \$9,999 ----- farms	6 898	1.1				
\$1,000-----	49 665	1.1				
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms	8 565	1.1				
\$1,000-----	124 195	1.1				
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms	3 235	1.3				
\$1,000-----	72 247	1.3				
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms	6 876	1.3				
\$1,000-----	219 819	1.3				
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms	3 487	1.3				
\$1,000-----	155 476	1.3				
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms	11 572	1.2				
\$1,000-----	838 560	1.2				
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms	14 884	1.0				
\$1,000-----	2 369 080	.9				
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms	5 496	-				
\$1,000-----	1 863 075	-				
\$500,000 or more ----- farms	1 806	-				
\$1,000-----	1 614 732	-				
Sales by commodity or commodity group:						
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms	64 155	.9				
\$1,000-----	5 251 328	.6				
Grains ----- farms	60 099	.9				
\$1,000-----	4 884 427	.6				
Corn for grain ----- farms	51 896	.9				
\$1,000-----	2 751 981	.6				
Wheat ----- farms	16 935	1.0				
Soybeans ----- farms	162 549	.8				
Sorghum for grain ----- farms	52 261	.9				
Barley ----- farms	1 916 168	.6				
Oats ----- farms	2 503	1.2				
Other grains ----- farms	29 070	1.2				
\$1,000-----	57	3.9				
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms	117	5.4				
Tobacco ----- farms	2 612	.9				
\$1,000-----	4 436	.9				
Other grains ----- farms	733	1.2				
\$1,000-----	20 106	1.0				
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms	1 714	1.0				
\$1,000-----	65 346	.6				
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms	667	1.6				
\$1,000-----	16 058	1.0				
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms	1 036	1.3				
\$1,000-----	221 264	.3				
Other crops ----- farms	98	3.1				
\$1,000-----	(D)	.3				
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms	37 393	.9				
\$1,000-----	2 085 535	.4				
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms	1 168	1.3				
\$1,000-----	78 570	3				
Dairy products ----- farms	2 695	1.1				
\$1,000-----	270 259	.8				
Cattle and calves ----- farms	26 419	.9				
\$1,000-----	725 634	.4				
Hogs and pigs ----- farms	14 142	.9				
\$1,000-----	985 472	.4				
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms	3 168	1.1				
\$1,000-----	6 267	1.8				
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms	2 670	1.3				
\$1,000-----	19 334	1.5				
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms	2 338	1.2				
\$1,000-----	10 586	1.0				
F FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹						
Total farm production expenses ----- farms	77 606	1.1				
\$1,000-----	5 088 894	.7				
Average per farm ----- dollars	65 573	1.3				
Livestock and poultry purchased ----- farms	21 039	1.7				
\$1,000-----	434 193	1.2				
Feed for livestock and poultry ----- farms	34 430	1.4				
\$1,000-----	531 978	1.2				
Commercially mixed formula feeds ----- farms	16 173	1.8				
\$1,000-----	223 070	1.4				
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ----- farms	63 590	1.2				
\$1,000-----	357 597	.9				
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms	62 069	1.2				
\$1,000-----	645 280	1.0				
Agricultural chemicals ----- farms	63 410	1.2				
\$1,000-----	439 672	1.0				
Petroleum products ----- farms	74 895	1.1				
\$1,000-----	322 542	.9				
Electricity ----- farms	60 437	1.1				
\$1,000-----	89 416	1.0				
Hired farm labor ----- farms	25 398	1.5				
\$1,000-----	300 090	.8				
Contract labor ----- farms	4 691	3.4				
\$1,000-----	15 302	5.3				
Repair and maintenance ----- farms	66 831	1.1				
\$1,000-----	375 501	1.0				
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ----- farms	32 690	1.4				
\$1,000-----	100 931	2.1				
Interest expense ----- farms	42 731	1.3				
\$1,000-----	431 344	1.1				
Secured by real estate ----- farms	26 975	1.5				
\$1,000-----	259 444	1.4				
Not secured by real estate ----- farms	28 488	1.5				
\$1,000-----	171 900	1.3				
Cash rent ----- farms	25 142	1.5				
\$1,000-----	422 189	1.3				
Property taxes ----- farms	65 516	1.1				
\$1,000-----	153 680	1.1				
All other farm production expenses ----- farms	73 378	1.1				
\$1,000-----	469 178	.9				
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹						
All farms ----- number	77 606	1.1				
\$1,000-----	2 169 423	1.0				
Average per farm ----- dollars	27 954	1.4				
Farms with net gains ² ----- number	54 137	1.2				
\$1,000-----	2 342 419	.9				
Average net gain ----- dollars	43 268	1.5				
Farms with net losses ----- number	23 469	1.5				
\$1,000-----	172 996	2.2				
Average net loss ----- dollars	7 371	2.6				
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME						
Government payments ----- farms	40 252	.9				
\$1,000-----	320 532	.6				
Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms	23 144	1.6				
\$1,000-----	133 464	2.8				
Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms	9 379	2.4				
\$1,000-----	63 247	4.3				
Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms	5 767	3.1				
\$1,000-----	53 123	4.3				
Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms	941	7.6				
\$1,000-----	4 958	10.2				
Other farm-related income sources ----- farms	11 826	2.1				

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE							
Total cropland	farms--	72 626	All operators	farms--	77 610		
	acres--	24 164 457		acres--	27 250 340		
Harvested cropland	farms--	69 425	Full owners	farms--	34 158		
	acres--	21 868 287		acres--	4 758 798		
Farms by acres harvested:			Part owners	farms--	29 217		
1 to 9 acres	farms--	5 140		acres--	17 196 302		
	acres--	25 593	Tenants	farms--	14 235		
10 to 19 acres	farms--	4 480		acres--	5 295 240		
	acres--	60 882					
20 to 29 acres	farms--	3 193	OWNED AND RENTED LAND				
	acres--	74 420	Land owned	farms--	64 128		
30 to 49 acres	farms--	4 866		acres--	11 901 841		
	acres--	184 450	Owned land in farms	farms--	63 375		
50 to 99 acres	farms--	8 588		acres--	10 454 583		
	acres--	620 200	Land rented or leased from others	farms--	43 623		
100 to 199 acres	farms--	11 372		acres--	16 873 903		
	acres--	1 634 226	Rented or leased land in farms	landlords--	137 592		
200 to 499 acres	farms--	16 728		farms--	43 452		
	acres--	5 473 785	Rented or leased to others	farms--	16 795 757		
500 to 999 acres	farms--	10 803		acres--			
	acres--	7 476 329	Land rented or leased to others	farms--	11 116		
1,000 acres or more	farms--	4 255		acres--	1 525 404		
	acres--	6 318 402					
Cropland:			OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS				
Pasture or grazing only	farms--	20 462	Operators by place of residence:				
	acres--	903 169	On farm operated		55 586		
Other cropland	farms--	35 425			.9		
	acres--	1 393 001	Not on farm operated		17 643		
					1.0		
Total woodland	farms--	26 338	Not reported		4 381		
	acres--	1 558 764			1.0		
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and			OPERATORS BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION				
woodland pastured	farms--	13 092	Operators by principal occupation:				
	acres--	689 870	Farming		47 875		
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms--	48 459			.8		
	acres--	837 249	Other		29 735		
Irrigated land	farms--	2 061			1.1		
	acres--	328 316	OPERATORS BY DAYS WORKED OFF FARM				
Acres irrigated:			Any		38 703		
1 to 9 acres	farms--	740			1.0		
	acres--	1 889	200 days or more		24 056		
10 to 49 acres	farms--	278			1.1		
	acres--	6 691	OPERATORS BY SEX				
50 to 99 acres	farms--	201	Male	farms--	73 985		
	acres--	14 587		acres--	26 638 686		
100 to 199 acres	farms--	356	Female	farms--	3 625		
	acres--	49 879		acres--	611 654		
200 to 499 acres	farms--	324	Average age of operator	years--	51.7		
	acres--	101 234			1.2		
500 to 999 acres	farms--	117	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION				
	acres--	76 015	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms--	65 752		
1,000 acres or more	farms--	45		acres--	21 125 676		
	acres--	78 021	Partnership	farms--	8 997		
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms--	2 024		acres--	4 242 130		
	acres--	325 691	Corporation:				
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms--	83	Family held	farms--	2 125		
	acres--	2 625		acres--	1 640 582		
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			More than 10 stockholders	farms--	38		
Diverted under annual commodity programs	farms--	32 510		farms--	4.2		
	acres--	521 280	10 or less stockholders	farms--	2 087		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve	farms--	8 547	Other than family held	farms--	.7		
Programs	acres--	465 026		acres--	1 995 572		
			More than 10 stockholders	farms--	1.3		
			10 or less stockholders	farms--	3.6		
			Other	farms--	190		
			cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms--	2.1		
				acres--			
			Other — cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms--	500		
				acres--	1.7		
					142 380		
					1.5		
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS¹							
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms--	77 606	HIRE FARM LABOR				
\$1,000--			Hired workers by days worked:				
Average per farm	dollars--	41 843 678	150 days or more	farms--	10 392		
Average per acre	dollars--	539 181		workers--	20 763		
		1 548	Less than 150 days	farms--	22 302		
				workers--	63 213		
					34.1		
					21.3		
					42.2		
					35.4		
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT¹							
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms--	77 455	INJURIES AND DEATHS				
\$1,000--			Farm-related injuries:				
Average per farm	dollars--	5 516 277	Operator and family members	farms--	622		
		71 219		number--	705		
			Hired workers	farms--	413		
				number--	722		
					1.4		
					1.4		
					1.0		
					.7		
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹							
Commercial fertilizer	farms--	61 916	Farm-related deaths:				
acres on which used--		15 210 333	Operator and family members	farms--	21		
				number--	22		
			Hired workers	farms--	5		
				number--	5		
					5.3		
					5.0		
					6.9		
					6.9		

See footnotes at end of table.

C-8 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
F FARMS BY SIZE							
1 to 9 acres ----- farms --	5 026	1.4	Cattle and calves sold ----- farms --	26 419	.9		
acres--	19 656	1.7	number--	1 130 433	.5		
10 to 49 acres ----- farms --	12 191	1.4	\$1,000--	725 634	.4		
acres--	326 158	1.3	Hogs and pigs inventory ----- farms --	13 433	.9		
50 to 69 acres ----- farms --	3 449	1.2	number--	5 641 115	.4		
acres--	201 606	1.2	Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms --	14 142	.9		
70 to 99 acres ----- farms --	5 665	1.1	number--	10 330 124	.5		
acres--	464 346	1.1	\$1,000--	985 472	.4		
100 to 139 acres ----- farms --	5 739	1.1	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ----- farms --	3 204	1.1		
acres--	670 988	1.1	number--	110 302	1.2		
140 to 179 acres ----- farms --	5 386	1.2	Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms --	3 029	1.1		
acres--	849 170	1.2	number--	104 207	1.8		
180 to 219 acres ----- farms --	4 097	1.2	Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms --	7 357	1.1		
acres--	809 827	1.2	number--	46 088	1.2		
220 to 259 acres ----- farms --	3 601	1.3	Horses and ponies sold ----- farms --	1 797	1.3		
acres--	856 115	1.3	number--	8 254	2.4		
260 to 499 acres ----- farms --	13 629	1.2	POULTRY				
acres--	4 993 550	1.1	Chickens 3 months old or older inventory ----- farms --	2 248	1.3		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms --	12 833	.9	number--	4 170 867	.3		
acres--	8 923 941	.9	Hens and pullets of laying age ----- farms --	2 222	1.3		
1,000 to 1,999 acres ----- farms --	5 115	—	number--	3 874 406	.3		
2,000 acres or more ----- farms --	6 735 935	—	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ----- farms --	123	3.1		
acres--	879	—	number--	60 004	7.0		
2 399 048	—	—	CROPS HARVESTED				
F FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION							
Cash grains (011) ----- farms --	49 694	.9	Corn for grain or seed ----- farms --	55 685	.9		
acres--	21 989 234	.7	acres--	10 770 985	.6		
Field crops, except cash grains (013) ----- farms --	2 116	1.5	bushels--	1 532 681 088	.6		
acres--	217 506	1.4	Corn for silage or green chop ----- farms --	5 005	.9		
Vegetables and melons (016) ----- farms --	491	1.8	acres--	164 698	.8		
acres--	78 536	1.2	Sorghum for grain or seed ----- farms --	2 659 536	.9		
Fruits and tree nuts (017) ----- farms --	530	2.0	acres--	2 811	1.2		
acres--	37 920	2.2	bushels--	201 360	1.1		
Horticultural specialties (018) ----- farms --	866	1.3	Wheat for grain ----- farms --	17 832 460	1.1		
acres--	61 293	1.0	acres--	17 061	1.0		
General farms, primarily crop (019) ----- farms --	1 000	1.6	bushels--	54 096 203	.8		
acres--	197 944	1.4	Oats for grain ----- farms --	5 635	.9		
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) ----- farms --	18 252	.9	acres--	108 363	.8		
acres--	3 725 475	.6	bushels--	6 704 097	.8		
Dairy farms (024) ----- farms --	2 027	1.2	Soybeans for beans ----- farms --	52 339	.9		
acres--	623 466	1.0	acres--	8 932 399	.6		
Poultry and eggs (025) ----- farms --	306	2.0	bushels--	373 563 650	.6		
acres--	33 546	1.7	LIVESTOCK				
Animal specialties (027) ----- farms --	1 810	1.6	Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms --	27 481	.9		
acres--	83 450	1.6	number--	902 899	.8		
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) ----- farms --	518	1.6	tons, dry--	2 463 316	.8		
acres--	201 970	1.2	Alfalfa hay ----- farms --	21 455	.9		
L LIVESTOCK			acres--	564 384	.8		
Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms --	27 405	.9	tons, dry--	1 792 941	.8		
number--	1 601 261	.7	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) ----- farms --	1 714	1.0		
Beef cows ----- farms --	19 392	.9	acres--	99 422	.8		
number--	447 201	.8	Land in orchards ----- farms --	882	1.6		
Milk cows ----- farms --	3 050	1.0	acres--	11 067	1.6		
number--	151 503	.9					

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

**Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More:
1992**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)			
F FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS								
Farms ----- number	55 921	.9	Total farm production expenses ----- farms	56 098	1.2			
Land in farms ----- acres	25 952 055	.6	\$1,000-----	4 966 049	.7			
Average size of farm ----- acres	464	1.1	Average per farm ----- dollars	88 525	1.4			
M MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD								
Total sales (see text) ----- farms	55 921	.9	Livestock and poultry purchased ----- farms	16 124	1.9			
Average per farm ----- \$1,000	7 257 183	.5	\$1,000-----	424 826	1.2			
Average per farm ----- dollars	129 776	1.1	Feed for livestock and poultry ----- farms	24 676	1.6			
Farms by value of sales:			\$1,000-----	519 362	1.2			
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms	8 565	1.1	farms-----	12 397	2.1			
\$1,000-----	124 195	1.1	\$1,000-----	219 686	1.4			
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms	3 235	1.3	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ----- farms	52 681	1.2			
\$1,000-----	72 247	1.3	\$1,000-----	352 968	.9			
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms	6 876	1.3	Commercial fertilizer ----- farms	51 055	1.2			
\$1,000-----	219 819	1.3	\$1,000-----	635 361	1.0			
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms	3 487	1.3	Agricultural chemicals ----- farms	51 337	1.3			
\$1,000-----	155 476	1.3	\$1,000-----	433 639	1.0			
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms	11 572	1.2	Petroleum products ----- farms	55 243	1.2			
\$1,000-----	838 560	1.2	\$1,000-----	312 411	.9			
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms	14 884	1.0	Electricity ----- farms	48 508	1.2			
\$1,000-----	2 369 080	.9	\$1,000-----	85 430	1.0			
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms	5 496	—	Hired farm labor ----- farms	22 169	1.5			
\$1,000-----	1 863 075	—	\$1,000-----	297 956	.8			
\$500,000 or more ----- farms	1 806	—	Contract labor ----- farms	3 724	3.7			
\$1,000-----	1 614 732	—	\$1,000-----	14 206	5.3			
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Repair and maintenance ----- farms	51 697	1.2			
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms	51 874	.9	\$1,000-----	360 713	1.0			
\$1,000-----	5 205 990	.6	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ----- farms	26 819	1.5			
Grains ----- farms	50 511	.9	\$1,000-----	97 459	2.2			
\$1,000-----	4 846 710	.6	Interest expense ----- farms	36 763	1.4			
Corn for grain ----- farms	46 233	.9	\$1,000-----	417 755	1.1			
\$1,000-----	2 734 331	.6	Secured by real estate ----- farms	22 498	1.6			
Wheat ----- farms	15 077	1.0	\$1,000-----	247 827	1.4			
\$1,000-----	159 387	.8	Not secured by real estate ----- farms	26 107	1.5			
Soybeans ----- farms	46 689	.9	\$1,000-----	169 928	1.3			
\$1,000-----	1 900 461	.6						
Sorghum for grain ----- farms	2 099	1.3	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹					
\$1,000-----	28 118	1.2	All farms ----- number	56 098	1.2			
Barley ----- farms	48	4.0	\$1,000-----	2 212 110	1.0			
\$1,000-----	108	5.7	Average per farm ----- dollars	39 433	1.6			
Oats ----- farms	2 412	1.0						
\$1,000-----	4 304	1.0	Farms with net gains ² ----- number	46 591	1.3			
Other grains ----- farms	680	1.2	\$1,000-----	2 327 939	.9			
\$1,000-----	20 001	1.0	Average net gain ----- dollars	49 965	1.6			
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms	—	—	Farms with net losses ----- number	9 507	2.5			
\$1,000-----	—	—	\$1,000-----	115 829	2.7			
Tobacco ----- farms	2	21.4	Average net loss ----- dollars	12 184	3.7			
\$1,000-----	(D)							
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms	8 072	1.0	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME					
\$1,000-----	52 637	1.1	Government payments ----- farms	35 710	.9			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms	1 388	1.0	\$1,000-----	308 399	.6			
\$1,000-----	64 643	.6	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms	18 908	1.7			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms	317	2.0	\$1,000-----	116 930	3.0			
\$1,000-----	15 358	1.0	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms	8 475	2.4			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms	766	1.3	\$1,000-----	61 351	4.4			
\$1,000-----	220 319	.3	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms	3 357	4.0			
Other crops ----- farms	62	3.4	\$1,000-----	40 441	5.2			
\$1,000-----	(D)		Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms	641	9.0			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms	26 786	.9	\$1,000-----	3 817	11.7			
\$1,000-----	2 051 193	.4	Other farm-related income sources ----- farms	10 742	2.2			
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms	654	1.4	\$1,000-----	11 320	4.1			
\$1,000-----	78 130	.3						
Dairy products ----- farms	2 656	1.1						
\$1,000-----	270 120	.8						
Cattle and calves ----- farms	19 269	.9						
\$1,000-----	702 228	.4						
Hogs and pigs ----- farms	12 125	.9						
\$1,000-----	979 420	.4						
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms	1 998	1.1						
\$1,000-----	4 923	2.1						
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms	1 064	1.3	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS					
\$1,000-----	16 372	1.8	Total ----- farms	9 378	.8			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms	1 330	1.2	\$1,000-----	340 272	.5			
\$1,000-----	9 121	1.1						

See footnotes at end of table.

C-10 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

**Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More:
1992—Con.**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE					
Total cropland	farms--	54 233	.9	Farms by type of organization	
	acres--	23 422 110	.6	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) farms--	46 155
Harvested cropland	farms--	53 622	.9	acres--	19 987 473
	acres--	21 488 066	.6	Partnership--	7 294
Cropland:				farms--	4 123 060
Pasture or grazing only	farms--	14 159	1.0	Corporation:	
	acres--	740 173	.9	Family held	farms--
Total woodland	farms--	17 684	1.0	1 939	.7
	acres--	1 246 146	.8	acres--	1 621 215
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and				More than 10 stockholders	30
woodland pastured	farms--	8 681	1.0	10 or less stockholders	farms--
	acres--	565 414	.8	1 909	.7
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms--	34 672	.9	Other than family held	farms--
	acres--	718 385	.7	182	1.9
Irrigated land	farms--	1 756	.9	acres--	94 100
	acres--	326 633	.6	More than 10 stockholders	farms--
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms--	1 735	.9	35	3.5
	acres--	324 203	.6	10 or less stockholders	farms--
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms--	65	3.7	147	2.2
	acres--	2 430	3.4	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms--
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:				351	1.9
Diverted under annual commodity programs	farms--	31 344	.9	acres--	126 207
	acres--	518 693	.6	Hired farm labor	
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve	farms--	6 208	1.0	Hired workers by days worked:	
Programs	acres--	339 259	.9	150 days or more	farms--
				9 332	33.7
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS¹					
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms--	56 098	1.2	workers--	19 663
\$1,000--		39 607 370	.9	farms--	19 114
Average per farm	dollars--	706 039	1.5	workers--	56 981
Average per acre	dollars--	1 542	1.3	INJURIES AND DEATHS	
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT¹					
Estimated market value of all machinery and	farms--	56 067	1.2	Farm-related injuries:	
equipment	\$1,000--	5 196 491	1.0	Operator and family members	farms--
Average per farm	dollars--	92 684	1.6	561	1.4
			Hired workers	farms--	
			398	1.0	
			number--	704	.6
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹					
Commercial fertilizer	farms--	50 945	1.2	Farm-related deaths:	
acres on which used--		14 955 518	1.0	Operator and family members	farms--
			15	4.9	
			number--	(D)	
			Hired workers	farms--	
			5	6.9	
			number--	(D)	
TENURE OF OPERATOR					
All operators	farms--	55 921	.9	F FARMS BY SIZE	
	acres--	25 952 055	.6	1 to 9 acres	farms--
Full owners	farms--	17 038	1.0	1 530	1.4
	acres--	3 776 882	.9	10 to 49 acres	farms--
Part owners	farms--	26 722	.9	2 193	1.2
	acres--	16 981 112	.6	50 to 69 acres	farms--
Tenants	farms--	12 161	1.1	1 286	1.3
	acres--	5 194 061	.8	70 to 99 acres	farms--
			3 318	1.2	
			100 to 139 acres	farms--	
			4 153	1.2	
			140 to 179 acres	farms--	
			4 546	1.2	
			180 to 219 acres	farms--	
			3 645	1.3	
			220 to 259 acres	farms--	
			3 341	1.3	
			260 to 499 acres	farms--	
			13 182	1.2	
			500 to 999 acres	farms--	
			12 750	.9	
			1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms--	
			5 102	-	
			2,000 acres or more	farms--	
			875	-	
OWNED AND RENTED LAND					
Land owned	farms--	44 396	.9	F FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION	
	acres--	10 383 922	.8	Cash grains (011)	farms--
Owned land in farms	farms--	43 760	.9	41 377	.9
	acres--	9 358 357	.7	Field crops, except cash grains (013)	farms--
Land rented or leased from others	farms--	38 975	.9	458	1.9
	acres--	16 661 326	.6	Vegetables and melons (016)	farms--
Rented or leased land in farms	landlords--	130 346	.8	288	2.0
	farms--	38 883	.8	Fruits and tree nuts (017)	farms--
	acres--	16 593 698	.6	143	2.8
Land rented or leased to others	farms--	6 360	1.0	Horticultural specialties (018)	farms--
	acres--	1 093 193	1.0	638	1.4
			General farms, primarily crop (019)	farms--	
			385	1.7	
			Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)	farms--	
			9 962	.9	
			Dairy farms (024)	farms--	
			2 005	1.2	
			Poultry and eggs (025)	farms--	
			139	1.9	
			Animal specialties (027)	farms--	
			224	2.4	
			General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)	farms--	
			302	1.7	
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS					
Operators by place of residence:				LIVESTOCK	
On farm operated		40 829	.9	Cattle and calves inventory	farms--
Not on farm operated		12 339	1.1	19 315	1.0
Not reported		2 753	1.0	number--	1 468 769
Operators by principal occupation:				Beef cows	farms--
Farming		41 526	.9	13 125	1.0
Other		14 395	1.1	number--	382 978
Operators by days worked off farm:				Milk cows	farms--
Any		24 032	1.1	2 812	1.1
200 days or more		12 579	1.2	number--	151 014
Operators by sex:				Cattle and calves sold	farms--
Male		54 042	.9	19 269	.9
Female		1 879	1.3	number--	1 074 248
Average age of operator	years--	51.3	1.3	\$1,000--	702 228
			Hogs and pigs inventory	farms--	
			11 491	.9	
			Hogs and pigs sold	farms--	
			5 581 092	.4	
			number--	12 125	.9
			\$1,000--	10 239 394	
			979 420	.4	
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms--	
			1 972	1.1	
			number--	78 885	
			Sheep and lambs sold	farms--	
			1 926	1.1	
			number--	79 432	
			Horses and ponies inventory	farms--	
			3 263	1.1	
			number--	20 550	
			Horses and ponies sold	farms--	
			707	1.5	
			number--	5 488	
			3.4		

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More:
1992—Con.**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
POULTRY						
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms--	1 043	1.4	Wheat for grain	farms--	15 152
number--		4 122 975	.3	acres--	1 047 659	1.0
Hens and pullets of laying age	farms--	1 034	1.4	bushels--	52 964 016	.8
number--		3 835 409	.3	Oats for grain	farms--	5 183
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms--	57	4.1	acres--	104 312	.8
number--		53 845	7.7	bushels--	6 520 764	.8
CROPS HARVESTED						
Corn for grain or seed	farms--	49 306	.9	Soybeans for beans	farms--	46 713
acres--		10 657 442	.6	acres--	8 820 731	.6
bushels--		1 521 093 484	.6	bushels--	370 090 708	.6
Corn for silage or green chop	farms--	4 824	.9	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass	farms--	20 068
acres--		162 138	.8	silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	acres--	785 665
Sorghum for grain or seed	tons, green--	2 624 005	.9	tons, dry--	2 244 921	.8
farms--		2 365	1.3	Alfalfa hay	farms--	16 303
acres--		191 661	1.1	acres--	500 549	.8
bushels--		17 191 740	1.2	tons, dry--	1 653 297	.8
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms--	1 388	
				acres--	98 446	1.0
			Land in orchards	farms--	345	
				acres--	8 723	1.9

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1987 to 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more		
	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	
Farms-----	-12.6	1.4	-10.8	1.5	
Land in farms -----	-4.5	1.2	-3.9	1.2	
Average size of farm -----	9.3	2.2	7.7	2.3	
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :					
Average per farm -----	33.8	3.1	31.3	3.2	
Average per acre -----	22.7	2.5	22.8	2.6	
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :					
Average per farm -----	16.9	2.8	16.3	3.0	
Farms by size:					
1 to 9 acres -----	-15.3	1.9	-14.3	2.1	
10 to 49 acres -----	-6.0	2.0	27.5	2.6	
50 to 179 acres -----	-15.0	1.5	-7.4	1.9	
180 to 499 acres -----	-20.2	1.6	-21.0	1.6	
500 to 999 acres -----	-10.4	1.4	-10.6	1.4	
1,000 to 1,999 acres -----	16.1	-	15.8	-	
2,000 acres or more -----	43.4	-	42.7	-	
Total cropland -----	-12.6	1.4	-10.9	1.5	
farms--	-3.7	1.2	-3.1	1.2	
acres--	-13.2	1.4	-11.0	1.5	
Harvested cropland -----	8.8	1.3	10.0	1.3	
Irrigated land -----	26.1	1.6	30.1	1.7	
farms--	57.8	1.5	59.1	1.6	
Market value of agricultural products sold -----	\$1,000 --	15.1	1.2	1.2	
Average per farm -----	\$1,000 --	31.6	2.5	2.6	
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops -----	\$1,000 --	26.3	1.4	1.4	
Livestock, poultry, and their products -----	\$1,000 --	-6.0	.8	.8	
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than \$2,500 -----	-13.7	1.8	(X)	(X)	
\$2,500 to \$4,999 -----	-16.7	1.9	(X)	(X)	
\$5,000 to \$9,999 -----	-21.0	1.6	(X)	(X)	
\$10,000 to \$24,999 -----	-21.1	1.6	-21.1	1.6	
\$25,000 to \$49,999 -----	-22.2	1.7	-22.2	1.7	
\$50,000 to \$99,999 -----	-21.6	1.7	-21.6	1.7	
\$100,000 to \$249,999 -----	-.5	1.5	-.5	1.5	
\$250,000 to \$499,999 -----	51.2	(L)	51.2	(L)	
\$500,000 or more -----	70.5	(L)	70.5	(L)	
Total farm production expenses ¹ -----	\$1,000--	11.7	1.6	1.7	
Average per farm -----	\$1,000--	27.7	2.7	2.9	
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹ -----	farms--	-12.6	1.5	1.7	
\$1,000--	25.3	1.9	25.2	1.9	
Average per farm -----	\$1,000--	43.4	3.4	3.5	
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming -----	-16.2	1.3	-15.3	1.4	
Other -----	-6.1	1.8	5.2	2.3	
Operators by days worked off farm:					
Any -----	-11.3	4.5	-6.8	4.8	
200 days or more -----	-7.5	4.7	3.9	5.3	
Livestock and poultry:					
Cattle and calves inventory -----	farms--	-17.7	1.3	-18.0	1.4
number--	15.1	1.0	-14.9	1.0	
Beef cows -----	farms--	-16.0	1.3	-14.7	1.5
number--	12.5	1.3	-11.9	1.3	
Milk cows -----	farms--	-29.1	1.3	-26.7	1.4
number--	18.7	1.3	-18.4	1.3	
Cattle and calves sold -----	farms--	-19.4	1.3	-19.3	1.4
number--	19.7	.7	-19.5	.7	
Hogs and pigs inventory -----	farms--	-21.4	1.2	-21.4	1.3
number--	1.9	.1	.9	.9	
Hogs and pigs sold -----	farms--	-20.7	1.2	-20.8	1.3
number--	4.6	1.0	4.7	1.0	
Sheep and lambs inventory -----	farms--	-18.9	1.4	-22.4	1.4
number--	20.0	1.4	-23.0	1.6	
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory -----	farms--	-44.0	1.1	-49.1	1.1
number--	5.1	.6	-4.6	.6	
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold -----	farms--	-58.4	1.6	-67.4	1.6
number--	86.2	1.5	-87.3	1.5	
Selected crops harvested:					
Corn for grain or seed -----	farms--	-16.4	1.4	-13.2	1.5
acres--	17.6	1.4	18.6	1.4	
bushels--	31.2	1.5	32.0	1.5	
Corn for silage or green chop -----	farms--	-8.2	1.5	-8.1	1.5
acres--	10.2	1.5	10.2	1.5	
tons, green--	7.2	1.5	7.0	1.5	
Wheat for grain -----	farms--	-20.1	1.4	-17.1	1.5
acres--	12.7	1.6	15.2	1.7	
bushels--	10.7	1.6	12.9	1.6	
Soybeans for beans -----	farms--	-15.0	1.4	-11.1	1.5
acres--	1.9	1.3	3.0	1.3	
bushels--	13.4	1.4	14.2	1.4	
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) -----	farms--	-10.2	1.4	-10.0	1.5
acres--	8.5	1.3	-8.6	1.4	
tons, dry--	9.5	1.3	-9.2	1.3	
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) -----	farms--	16.9	1.9	18.2	2.0
acres--	25.1	1.6	25.5	1.6	

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-13

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois-----	77 610	.9	27 250 340	.6	351	1.1	539 181	1.4	5 516 277	1.0
Adams-----	1 500	1.2	464 834	1.1	310	1.6	320 443	4.0	78 981	5.3
Alexander-----	171	.8	69 354	1.2	406	1.4	344 357	7.0	11 625	6.4
Bond-----	629	1.7	182 572	2.0	290	2.6	321 433	7.2	37 137	8.4
Boone-----	500	1.2	135 163	1.3	270	1.7	530 924	6.2	35 903	5.8
Brown-----	386	.6	144 435	.7	374	.9	344 155	10.4	21 172	6.9
Bureau-----	1 273	1.0	482 169	.9	379	1.4	612 973	2.8	107 898	4.1
Calhoun-----	462	1.5	99 675	1.7	216	2.2	212 393	7.8	15 838	10.9
Carroll-----	657	1.0	238 906	.9	364	1.3	530 372	4.1	53 601	3.2
Cass-----	429	.7	209 437	.8	488	1.1	686 093	4.4	41 527	4.6
Champaign-----	1 452	.8	571 807	.7	394	1.1	789 533	2.3	132 615	3.3
Christian-----	892	1.1	390 149	.8	437	1.3	851 725	3.1	79 455	4.3
Clark-----	685	1.5	259 923	1.4	379	2.0	478 172	4.9	49 218	5.7
Clay-----	670	1.6	223 764	1.6	334	2.3	307 101	4.4	37 064	6.2
Clinton-----	942	1.1	229 120	1.1	243	1.6	316 715	4.0	67 961	5.1
Coles-----	700	1.0	263 425	.8	376	1.3	661 617	4.7	55 008	4.2
Cook-----	256	1.1	40 917	2.3	160	2.5	904 259	13.0	14 461	6.9
Crawford-----	543	1.7	223 561	1.2	412	2.1	479 610	3.8	47 161	7.1
Cumberland-----	645	1.2	176 012	1.3	273	1.7	366 899	5.7	35 879	6.5
De Kalb-----	942	.8	377 512	.6	401	1.0	912 437	2.6	87 371	2.7
De Witt-----	496	1.0	206 271	1.0	416	1.4	874 856	5.3	44 751	8.8
Douglas-----	682	.9	259 498	.7	380	1.2	724 414	4.3	53 600	5.8
Du Page-----	95	.8	18 206	2.7	192	2.8	588 431	3.4	5 855	12.3
Edgar-----	823	1.2	354 480	.9	431	1.5	705 605	4.2	71 601	5.4
Edwards-----	325	1.4	116 312	1.2	358	1.8	293 120	7.4	19 371	11.5
Effingham-----	1 140	1.5	257 761	1.6	226	2.2	327 482	6.0	62 255	5.8
Fayette-----	1 151	1.8	341 274	1.6	297	2.4	279 723	4.2	61 556	4.9
Ford-----	613	.8	300 127	.7	490	1.1	789 625	3.2	57 331	4.2
Franklin-----	538	1.1	160 533	1.3	298	1.7	297 381	13.5	23 047	7.6
Fulton-----	1 165	1.1	431 415	1.0	370	1.5	390 751	3.7	67 007	4.3
Gallatin-----	241	1.3	171 938	.8	713	1.6	747 945	4.3	29 923	17.1
Greene-----	783	1.5	303 715	1.2	388	1.9	392 589	5.1	54 808	4.7
Grundy-----	533	1.9	225 506	1.5	423	2.4	948 046	5.1	53 501	6.2
Hamilton-----	469	1.2	201 567	1.2	430	1.7	330 543	5.8	23 587	9.1
Hancock-----	1 182	1.4	433 246	1.2	367	1.8	415 920	3.6	74 270	4.1
Hardin-----	175	1.4	37 976	2.1	217	2.5	124 517	5.9	4 088	5.6
Henderson-----	468	.9	203 974	1.0	436	1.4	541 563	5.7	36 680	5.7
Henry-----	1 438	1.0	453 944	.8	316	1.3	483 839	3.2	104 801	4.2
Iroquois-----	1 509	1.0	662 629	.8	439	1.3	665 116	3.0	129 921	3.1
Jackson-----	664	1.0	186 425	1.0	281	1.4	298 112	10.9	32 372	6.8
Jasper-----	772	1.3	258 014	1.3	334	1.8	429 588	4.5	52 069	5.9
Jefferson-----	880	1.3	217 191	1.5	247	2.0	212 136	4.9	35 069	6.0
Jersey-----	557	1.3	180 675	1.3	324	1.8	385 555	7.2	37 664	7.9
Jo Daviess-----	955	1.0	290 454	.9	304	1.4	321 116	4.2	63 202	4.4
Johnson-----	414	1.1	94 681	1.6	229	2.0	154 226	7.0	12 211	6.1
Kane-----	703	1.0	203 590	.9	290	1.4	1 093 428	5.3	55 892	4.4
Kankakee-----	928	1.3	358 920	.9	387	1.6	732 634	4.3	78 777	4.2
Kendall-----	500	.8	178 222	.9	356	1.2	951 531	5.8	40 947	6.1
Knox-----	1 021	1.1	385 560	.9	378	1.4	528 236	3.8	73 102	4.1
Lake-----	375	.9	73 142	1.2	195	1.5	639 753	8.8	20 339	4.2
La Salle-----	1 669	1.1	612 112	1.0	367	1.5	761 637	2.8	137 928	3.6
Lawrence-----	365	1.3	169 292	1.0	464	1.7	524 689	6.3	30 285	4.8
Lee-----	1 006	1.1	414 442	.9	412	1.4	733 759	3.1	86 797	4.1
Livingston-----	1 562	.9	637 551	.8	408	1.2	667 954	2.9	123 425	3.6
Logan-----	834	1.1	369 952	.9	444	1.4	890 503	3.5	84 628	5.1
McDonough-----	905	1.3	344 649	1.2	381	1.8	532 846	3.3	56 556	4.4
McHenry-----	985	1.1	249 240	1.1	253	1.6	659 052	4.4	68 200	5.5
McLean-----	1 616	.9	709 106	.7	439	1.1	918 538	2.8	153 351	3.8
Macon-----	771	.7	310 518	.7	403	1.0	830 287	2.4	65 295	4.2
Macoupin-----	1 308	1.3	402 310	1.2	308	1.8	403 253	4.1	79 946	5.2
Madison-----	1 299	.9	299 709	1.0	231	1.4	391 144	6.5	81 208	4.5
Marion-----	861	1.6	253 916	1.6	295	2.3	245 552	8.3	34 582	6.8
Marshall-----	524	.9	203 749	1.0	389	1.4	727 492	5.6	43 910	5.6
Mason-----	489	1.0	282 222	.9	577	1.3	749 366	4.5	61 338	6.1
Massac-----	401	1.6	98 838	1.9	246	2.5	174 935	7.2	17 204	6.4
Menard-----	375	1.0	164 158	.9	438	1.4	715 937	6.1	31 116	9.2
Mercer-----	812	1.1	312 128	.9	384	1.4	407 272	3.2	57 552	4.3
Monroe-----	589	1.1	187 039	1.1	318	1.6	442 464	4.2	46 013	5.3
Montgomery-----	1 104	1.4	371 936	1.4	337	2.0	423 252	5.5	74 240	5.7
Morgan-----	864	1.0	311 266	.9	360	1.4	594 822	4.8	64 530	6.9
Moultrie-----	491	.9	184 599	.9	376	1.3	802 052	4.0	46 496	10.0
Ogle-----	1 141	1.1	392 639	.9	344	1.4	556 133	2.7	84 979	3.6
Peoria-----	957	1.0	261 482	1.0	273	1.4	473 037	4.1	52 990	5.0
Perry-----	544	1.4	167 602	1.8	308	2.2	224 258	11.8	28 265	8.3
Piatt-----	511	.8	251 277	.8	492	1.2	972 596	3.3	50 626	4.5
Pike-----	1 103	1.3	443 475	.9	402	1.6	375 638	3.9	61 262	5.5
Pope-----	246	1.1	67 998	1.6	276	1.9	219 075	12.8	7 147	13.3
Pulaski-----	218	1.7	82 426	1.5	378	2.2	282 471	4.9	12 117	13.3
Putnam-----	201	1.5	78 081	2.0	388	2.4	622 828	11.6	20 073	10.5
Randolph-----	945	1.1	270 598	1.1	286	1.6	274 889	7.7	47 127	5.9
Richland-----	545	1.4	188 999	1.2	347	1.9	401 164	5.7	33 158	6.8
Rock Island-----	632	.9	175 847	1.1	278	1.4	403 414	5.2	38 017	5.5
St. Clair-----	953	1.0	264 140	1.1	277	1.5	466 912	4.7	68 575	7.6
Saline-----	428	1.3	141 703	1.4	331	1.9	265 860	7.6	19 360	7.3
Sangamon-----	1 046	.8	446 750	.7	427	1.1	868 047	2.7	92 093	4.1

See footnotes at end of table.

C-14 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Schuylerville -----	490	1.4	207 388	1.3	423	1.9	312 573	10.4	24 417	7.4
Scott -----	337	1.5	128 867	1.4	382	2.1	446 768	7.7	27 195	6.1
Shelby -----	1 305	1.5	402 212	1.1	308	1.9	442 085	3.9	85 053	4.5
Stark -----	362	1.1	169 622	1.0	469	1.5	868 101	4.6	34 791	4.6
Stephenson -----	1 179	1.4	314 886	1.2	267	1.8	353 830	4.0	93 350	4.2
Tazewell -----	1 008	.7	336 450	.8	334	1.0	702 793	4.8	70 815	4.5
Union -----	482	1.0	119 370	1.3	248	1.6	191 712	4.4	17 797	5.4
Vermilion -----	1 112	1.1	488 215	.9	439	1.4	704 887	2.8	91 466	4.2
Wabash -----	232	.8	115 517	1.0	498	1.3	589 959	9.4	20 264	15.1
Warren -----	810	1.1	317 467	.9	392	1.4	625 584	4.2	65 418	6.7
Washington -----	831	1.1	297 003	1.0	357	1.5	472 261	4.7	66 661	4.6
Wayne -----	960	1.4	333 238	1.2	347	1.8	266 024	4.6	42 167	5.7
White -----	448	1.5	234 973	.8	524	1.7	485 223	4.3	33 611	6.4
Whiteside -----	1 133	.9	399 312	.8	352	1.2	577 265	10.5	85 873	5.8
Will -----	1 057	1.2	325 227	1.1	308	1.6	814 339	3.7	78 380	4.8
Williamson -----	538	.8	89 591	1.2	167	1.5	189 900	4.3	15 082	12.6
Winnebago -----	724	1.4	203 428	1.5	281	2.0	423 616	4.5	45 933	6.5
Woodford -----	973	.8	295 844	.9	304	1.2	606 187	5.1	68 144	6.0
Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois-----	71 219	1.5	7 336 864	.5	94 535	1.0	77 606	1.1	5 088 894	.7
Adams -----	52 619	5.5	110 057	.9	73 372	1.5	1 501	1.4	75 191	2.0
Alexander -----	67 982	6.9	13 673	1.1	79 957	1.4	171	2.6	8 140	5.7
Bond -----	59 041	8.5	43 648	1.9	69 393	2.5	629	1.7	31 118	4.1
Boone -----	71 950	5.9	40 376	1.2	80 752	1.7	499	1.1	33 259	2.8
Brown -----	55 716	7.2	26 693	.7	69 152	.9	387	1.5	20 351	4.4
Bureau -----	85 295	4.3	169 261	.6	132 962	1.2	1 273	1.0	120 299	1.5
Calhoun -----	34 282	11.1	17 565	1.5	38 019	2.1	462	2.3	13 500	5.6
Carroll -----	81 461	3.4	99 177	.6	150 955	1.2	658	1.1	83 563	1.3
Cass -----	96 350	4.7	61 901	.7	144 290	1.0	431	.9	43 223	2.8
Champaign -----	91 775	3.4	160 064	.6	110 237	1.1	1 451	.9	92 704	2.1
Christian -----	89 075	4.4	118 206	.7	132 518	1.3	892	.9	68 270	1.7
Clark -----	71 852	6.0	57 686	1.3	84 213	2.0	685	1.7	37 616	3.6
Clay -----	55 403	6.4	37 117	1.6	55 399	2.3	669	1.5	24 746	4.6
Clinton -----	72 145	5.3	95 027	.8	100 878	1.4	942	1.1	65 328	2.3
Coles -----	78 583	4.4	65 038	.8	92 911	1.3	700	1.3	40 607	3.1
Cook -----	56 269	7.0	20 435	1.0	79 824	1.5	257	1.4	17 798	4.6
Crawford -----	87 013	7.3	52 961	1.0	97 535	2.0	542	1.8	38 788	3.5
Cumberland -----	55 626	6.6	50 833	1.1	78 810	1.6	645	1.2	31 116	5.2
De Kalb -----	92 948	2.9	157 888	.4	167 610	.9	940	1.1	127 207	1.1
De Witt -----	90 223	8.9	55 011	.9	110 910	1.3	496	1.2	34 509	4.5
Douglas -----	78 592	5.9	79 241	.7	116 189	1.1	683	1.3	46 122	3.5
Du Page -----	61 635	12.5	20 349	.6	214 199	1.0	95	2.2	13 829	.8
Edgar -----	87 747	5.7	92 146	.8	111 963	1.4	822	1.7	55 919	2.4
Edwards -----	59 786	11.6	25 943	1.3	79 824	1.9	324	1.5	14 937	5.7
Effingham -----	54 706	6.0	71 298	1.4	62 542	2.1	1 138	1.5	51 409	3.2
Fayette -----	53 434	5.2	70 733	1.4	61 453	2.3	1 152	1.7	49 377	2.4
Ford -----	93 525	4.4	78 117	.7	127 433	1.1	613	1.1	48 812	2.8
Franklin -----	42 917	7.8	25 706	1.5	47 781	1.8	537	1.3	20 407	4.4
Fulton -----	57 616	4.5	85 618	1.0	73 492	1.5	1 163	1.3	61 590	2.2
Gallatin -----	124 160	17.1	37 685	.8	156 370	1.5	241	1.4	26 482	3.4
Greene -----	69 908	5.0	68 491	1.2	87 472	1.9	784	1.7	46 323	3.3
Grundy -----	105 942	6.7	52 931	1.4	99 308	2.4	533	1.7	40 211	4.8
Hamilton -----	50 185	9.2	32 521	1.1	69 342	1.6	470	1.3	22 656	5.0
Hancock -----	62 887	4.4	104 911	1.0	88 757	1.7	1 181	1.4	69 218	2.1
Hardin -----	23 358	6.0	2 045	3.3	11 687	3.6	175	2.1	1 767	8.3
Henderson -----	78 375	5.8	52 081	.9	111 284	1.3	468	1.1	39 135	2.6
Henry -----	72 880	4.3	170 765	.6	118 752	1.2	1 438	1.0	133 679	1.8
Iroquois -----	86 098	3.3	187 908	.7	124 525	1.2	1 509	1.2	130 909	1.9
Jackson -----	49 123	6.9	31 818	1.2	47 919	1.5	664	1.0	22 255	6.2
Jasper -----	67 359	6.0	69 735	1.1	90 330	1.7	773	1.5	45 340	2.9
Jefferson -----	39 806	6.1	30 005	1.4	34 097	1.9	881	1.5	23 801	4.5
Jersey -----	67 499	8.0	46 190	1.1	82 926	1.7	558	1.6	30 890	2.9
Jo Daviess -----	66 042	4.5	76 278	.9	79 872	1.4	957	.9	60 216	2.6
Johnson -----	29 494	6.2	10 660	1.8	25 750	2.1	414	1.3	10 014	7.4
Kane -----	79 505	4.5	85 546	.6	121 686	1.2	703	1.1	69 759	2.5
Kankakee -----	84 980	4.4	105 208	.8	113 371	1.5	927	1.3	73 607	1.9
Kendall -----	81 730	6.1	48 952	.7	97 904	1.1	501	.9	37 742	2.7
Knox -----	71 598	4.2	108 884	.7	106 644	1.3	1 021	1.0	83 798	2.1
Lake -----	54 382	4.3	31 750	.6	84 666	1.1	374	1.0	24 603	1.6

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-15

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
La Salle -----	82 641	3.7	158 028	.8	94 684	1.4	1 669	1.1	109 165	2.1
Lawrence -----	82 972	5.0	44 043	.9	120 667	1.6	365	1.6	31 356	3.3
Lee -----	86 194	4.3	125 835	.8	125 084	1.3	1 007	1.1	97 746	2.2
Livingston -----	79 271	3.8	175 249	.8	112 195	1.2	1 562	1.2	105 237	2.2
Logan -----	101 350	5.2	109 765	.8	131 613	1.3	835	1.3	69 591	2.9
McDonough -----	62 493	4.5	86 440	1.0	95 514	1.7	905	1.2	52 936	2.3
McHenry -----	69 239	5.7	95 340	.8	96 792	1.4	985	1.3	83 054	2.5
McLean -----	94 836	3.9	198 213	.7	122 657	1.1	1 617	.9	122 804	1.6
Macon -----	85 689	4.4	92 289	.6	119 701	1.0	771	.8	52 380	2.4
Macoupin -----	61 121	5.5	115 908	1.0	88 615	1.6	1 308	1.7	78 159	2.5
Madison -----	62 564	4.6	83 582	.9	64 343	1.3	1 298	.9	60 128	2.4
Marion -----	40 118	7.0	42 596	1.5	49 472	2.2	862	1.6	29 692	4.2
Marshall -----	83 638	5.7	50 141	1.0	95 688	1.4	525	.9	36 366	4.1
Mason -----	125 435	6.1	72 895	.7	149 070	1.3	489	1.0	49 484	2.4
Massac -----	42 903	6.6	16 102	2.1	40 154	2.7	401	1.8	12 949	7.9
Menard -----	82 976	9.3	47 505	.8	126 679	1.3	375	1.1	33 102	5.7
Mercer -----	70 964	4.5	82 050	.9	101 047	1.4	811	1.1	61 346	3.0
Monroe -----	78 120	5.4	41 264	1.1	70 058	1.6	589	1.2	29 056	2.1
Montgomery -----	67 308	5.8	97 960	1.2	88 732	1.9	1 103	1.4	64 816	3.2
Morgan -----	74 601	6.9	85 039	.8	98 425	1.3	865	.9	57 144	2.5
Moultrie -----	94 697	10.0	55 715	.8	113 472	1.2	491	.9	33 318	2.5
Ogle -----	74 543	3.7	132 187	.7	115 852	1.3	1 140	1.0	106 010	1.6
Peoria -----	55 956	5.2	63 924	1.0	66 796	1.4	957	1.2	44 582	2.5
Perry -----	51 958	8.4	23 206	1.9	42 658	2.3	544	1.5	15 384	6.0
Piatt -----	99 268	4.6	70 263	.8	137 500	1.1	510	1.1	40 490	2.8
Pike -----	56 152	5.8	97 272	.8	88 188	1.6	1 103	1.5	66 746	1.9
Pope -----	29 054	13.4	4 949	1.6	20 118	1.9	246	1.9	5 009	9.2
Pulaski -----	55 584	13.4	15 603	1.4	71 574	2.2	218	1.4	10 573	7.6
Putnam -----	100 363	10.7	32 719	1.1	162 781	1.8	200	1.8	22 842	7.6
Randolph -----	50 403	6.0	44 978	1.2	47 596	1.7	944	1.1	34 316	3.5
Richland -----	61 747	7.1	45 610	1.1	83 687	1.8	546	1.4	32 777	3.0
Rock Island -----	60 249	5.6	52 304	.9	82 760	1.3	631	1.0	39 026	2.6
St. Clair -----	72 033	7.7	65 608	1.0	68 844	1.5	952	1.2	42 412	3.5
Saline -----	45 235	7.6	27 001	1.3	63 086	1.9	428	2.0	17 292	5.5
Sangamon -----	88 043	4.2	137 833	.6	131 772	1.0	1 046	.8	83 571	1.7
Schuyler -----	49 729	7.5	33 502	1.4	68 372	2.0	491	1.4	19 652	7.6
Scott -----	80 697	6.3	30 849	1.5	91 539	2.1	337	1.4	20 680	6.7
Shelby -----	65 125	4.8	102 597	1.1	78 618	1.8	1 306	1.5	62 202	2.9
Stark -----	96 109	4.8	46 636	1.0	128 828	1.5	362	1.3	31 492	3.2
Stephenson -----	79 854	4.5	129 830	1.0	110 119	1.7	1 178	1.3	98 372	1.8
Tazewell -----	70 322	4.6	103 401	.7	102 581	1.0	1 007	1.0	62 526	2.3
Union -----	36 847	5.6	19 697	1.0	40 864	1.4	483	1.5	15 711	4.6
Vermilion -----	82 327	4.3	124 797	.8	112 227	1.4	1 111	1.0	75 476	2.7
Wabash -----	87 344	15.2	26 427	1.0	113 911	1.3	232	1.5	17 648	7.2
Warren -----	80 863	6.8	93 027	.8	114 848	1.3	809	.9	62 987	2.6
Washington -----	80 218	4.8	73 091	1.0	87 955	1.4	831	1.2	51 758	2.1
Wayne -----	43 924	5.9	56 809	1.1	59 176	1.8	960	1.6	40 780	2.0
White -----	75 025	6.6	46 864	.7	104 608	1.7	448	1.5	32 074	4.2
Whiteside -----	75 926	5.8	143 760	.6	126 885	1.1	1 131	1.0	111 187	2.5
Will -----	75 220	5.1	91 509	.8	86 574	1.5	1 056	1.4	67 075	1.8
Williamson -----	28 034	12.7	10 621	2.0	19 742	2.1	538	1.1	8 434	6.4
Winnebago -----	63 356	6.6	59 895	1.2	82 728	1.8	725	1.3	49 028	2.8
Woodford -----	70 910	6.2	98 004	.7	100 724	1.0	974	1.0	68 809	2.1

Farm production expenses¹—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased			Feed for livestock and poultry			Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value	Farms		Value	Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	
									Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Illinois-----	21 039	1.7	434 193	1.2	34 430	1.4	531 978	1.2	357 597	.9
Adams-----	510	7.4	8 658	6.7	819	5.2	14 035	4.4	1 218	3.1
Alexander-----	39	16.2	116	55.2	82	8.8	209	31.2	115	6.1
Bond-----	117	20.6	936	14.8	309	11.5	4 865	15.1	519	4.6
Boone-----	215	11.4	2 670	11.4	292	7.9	2 514	8.8	390	4.9
Brown-----	105	19.2	1 618	8.2	260	8.6	4 129	17.3	303	5.3
Bureau-----	378	9.5	11 414	5.5	547	7.4	9 168	6.1	1 155	2.2
Calhoun-----	143	16.9	1 413	15.8	231	12.3	2 541	9.2	269	9.1
Carroll-----	332	7.7	25 903	2.7	498	4.7	9 211	5.2	560	4.0
Cass-----	152	13.1	3 358	4.9	194	10.7	7 780	6.9	377	3.9
Champaign-----	137	18.3	1 973	3.3	251	11.3	2 521	13.0	1 337	1.7
Christian-----	131	17.0	1 557	16.8	289	11.9	2 577	7.8	771	2.6
Clark-----	124	18.6	1 288	12.7	213	13.5	2 183	8.1	562	4.0
Clay-----	99	22.6	585	31.9	242	12.3	970	14.6	539	4.6
Clinton-----	363	10.3	5 079	9.6	539	7.0	16 207	4.8	775	3.3

See footnotes at end of table.

C-16 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Coles -----	113	22.0	1 370	12.5	206	14.9	1 641	11.0	595	4.4	3 575	3.8
Cook -----	24	52.8	33	60.3	55	25.5	655	57.3	167	7.5	1 014	8.3
Crawford -----	123	15.2	2 179	3.7	212	13.5	4 576	6.4	457	4.4	3 245	5.8
Cumberland -----	168	15.7	2 893	29.8	284	11.5	5 346	14.6	588	3.3	2 075	7.6
De Kalb -----	225	9.7	26 178	.9	328	8.5	13 575	2.2	818	2.1	6 589	3.3
De Witt -----	52	26.2	1 394	40.4	158	14.1	1 693	12.0	470	2.5	3 061	6.5
Douglas -----	169	13.2	2 305	28.3	239	11.7	4 426	17.0	576	2.9	3 692	4.7
Du Page -----	15	25.7	65	26.4	27	13.1	129	14.1	46	7.4	499	2.4
Edgar -----	166	16.4	3 807	22.1	270	12.2	3 828	10.9	703	3.8	5 157	4.6
Edwards -----	95	18.2	1 071	5.0	180	12.1	2 410	10.3	264	7.1	1 111	16.6
Effingham -----	321	10.4	4 036	23.6	574	7.4	10 068	8.1	982	2.7	3 088	4.8
Fayette -----	338	10.8	3 172	12.1	500	8.2	6 338	4.6	944	3.8	3 416	4.5
Ford -----	100	18.7	2 316	1.3	138	17.2	3 327	16.8	582	2.3	4 175	4.2
Franklin -----	110	19.8	868	19.0	248	12.4	2 497	12.8	340	8.8	1 706	15.9
Fulton -----	392	10.4	5 506	3.4	617	6.7	5 009	11.0	968	2.6	4 718	3.6
Gallatin -----	47	23.0	360	10.6	73	19.0	737	7.4	212	6.8	2 382	3.2
Greene -----	270	12.1	2 705	13.3	529	6.3	6 689	10.0	622	4.4	3 298	5.3
Grundy -----	67	28.8	648	26.9	123	20.1	915	8.8	511	2.4	3 798	6.3
Hamilton -----	99	20.3	984	46.0	194	11.8	968	17.1	370	5.5	1 812	6.3
Hancock -----	445	8.8	9 205	6.2	597	6.7	8 890	6.5	964	3.8	4 612	3.4
Hardin -----	46	14.2	140	21.2	90	8.5	205	12.9	47	14.4	81	13.0
Henderson -----	202	11.2	4 594	16.0	326	7.1	4 039	13.2	377	4.5	2 578	4.4
Henry -----	535	7.9	24 380	4.0	809	5.0	23 163	2.9	1 291	1.9	6 595	3.2
Iroquois -----	338	10.9	9 189	5.3	438	9.2	13 749	9.4	1 409	2.0	10 044	3.5
Jackson -----	220	12.9	1 605	15.8	364	7.9	1 720	17.9	393	7.4	1 393	8.0
Jasper -----	220	12.4	2 468	6.4	335	9.8	9 258	10.7	680	3.4	2 835	6.5
Jefferson -----	238	12.9	1 480	13.8	422	8.3	2 862	17.5	608	5.3	1 621	5.5
Jersey -----	179	15.4	4 787	6.3	298	10.0	3 377	22.0	439	4.7	2 214	6.0
Jo Daviess -----	395	9.3	9 004	9.3	697	4.2	10 157	4.5	705	3.8	2 312	4.6
Johnson -----	105	19.6	1 721	4.7	236	10.4	1 467	8.4	134	16.2	398	22.7
Kane -----	224	13.3	7 532	5.2	309	9.1	4 871	13.2	525	4.5	4 818	2.1
Kankakee -----	154	17.5	1 911	18.1	241	12.8	3 402	9.5	821	2.4	5 930	3.2
Kendall -----	90	20.9	4 341	10.1	132	16.8	2 163	14.7	417	3.5	2 591	5.8
Knox -----	329	10.9	8 316	11.6	547	7.4	11 594	6.1	858	3.1	4 828	3.6
Lake -----	57	33.2	253	10.8	141	18.4	960	7.8	179	13.2	1 214	3.8
La Salle -----	246	13.6	5 957	4.0	411	10.4	3 667	7.9	1 565	1.7	9 738	3.4
Lawrence -----	85	21.7	1 137	3.7	166	13.2	6 125	3.9	284	5.8	2 399	3.2
Lee -----	265	12.1	12 497	4.1	327	11.1	6 037	17.3	904	2.7	6 440	2.9
Livingston -----	388	9.6	7 936	10.0	498	8.3	15 536	5.0	1 446	1.7	8 078	3.1
Logan -----	164	16.0	2 250	8.3	230	12.2	5 145	6.9	745	2.4	5 820	4.8
McDonough -----	210	14.9	4 052	6.4	347	11.1	3 733	10.1	795	3.8	4 478	3.3
McHenry -----	295	12.1	9 596	10.3	504	7.4	7 995	5.5	614	4.9	4 865	5.3
McLean -----	293	11.5	7 063	10.7	481	8.4	8 088	10.9	1 493	1.6	10 755	2.8
Macon -----	106	18.9	1 915	11.9	175	15.8	1 887	23.6	682	2.7	4 760	2.9
Macoupin -----	396	10.7	9 552	6.1	630	7.1	11 813	6.7	1 012	3.5	4 795	4.0
Madison -----	336	11.9	3 523	12.4	610	6.9	5 265	12.2	998	3.1	3 931	4.8
Marion -----	197	15.5	2 333	9.2	381	10.0	4 024	13.0	662	4.1	1 985	8.7
Marshall -----	148	15.2	2 134	7.0	217	11.9	2 740	21.9	477	2.5	3 054	5.7
Mason -----	86	24.3	3 124	8.7	145	16.8	4 237	5.0	441	2.3	3 773	4.3
Massac -----	111	19.9	659	16.0	179	11.7	1 224	27.2	249	6.5	963	10.3
Menard -----	98	17.3	2 769	7.0	179	12.6	3 468	2.3	292	4.2	2 665	8.4
Mercer -----	274	10.6	4 003	7.3	510	6.4	8 794	10.5	622	3.6	3 898	5.0
Monroe -----	201	12.7	1 650	11.2	323	7.6	4 839	7.4	441	5.7	2 036	5.3
Montgomery -----	308	11.8	4 662	14.4	522	8.2	6 959	11.2	924	2.9	4 314	6.3
Morgan -----	292	11.1	5 587	8.0	453	7.7	8 311	13.5	677	4.2	4 005	5.3
Moultrie -----	111	20.5	932	9.8	163	15.9	2 307	14.0	462	3.1	2 686	3.6
Ogle -----	469	7.2	22 055	3.9	628	5.3	10 943	4.9	913	3.0	5 785	2.8
Peoria -----	253	12.9	1 632	25.8	435	8.0	2 530	16.0	771	3.4	3 874	4.6
Perry -----	172	18.1	633	19.0	282	11.1	1 607	23.6	425	5.1	1 142	6.2
Piatt -----	49	21.3	904	8.1	83	22.1	905	13.1	481	2.6	3 750	3.2
Pike -----	426	9.1	3 976	8.2	688	5.5	11 254	4.6	872	4.0	3 914	3.3
Pope -----	89	19.9	558	11.5	184	8.9	802	34.6	126	13.3	251	15.4
Pulaski -----	66	26.0	624	11.0	101	17.0	500	14.9	168	7.0	623	8.2
Putnam -----	77	23.2	1 595	26.2	86	21.3	1 136	18.9	179	6.2	1 409	9.6
Randolph -----	324	10.5	3 483	15.9	499	7.0	4 368	11.3	667	4.1	2 464	8.5
Richland -----	147	14.7	2 007	19.1	233	11.3	6 666	4.6	458	4.6	2 179	4.8
Rock Island -----	195	13.9	6 278	3.2	372	8.3	5 474	7.1	514	3.7	2 022	3.8
St. Clair -----	249	13.9	1 954	34.0	436	9.1	3 547	11.3	792	3.4	3 181	4.4
Saline -----	139	18.9	1 263	50.8	228	11.7	840	26.3	299	8.2	1 621	8.4
Sangamon -----	206	13.2	3 438	29.3	401	8.9	6 408	3.8	807	3.6	6 350	3.2
Schuylerville -----	134	16.7	1 156	11.3	293	10.2	1 875	15.5	403	4.2	1 768	8.9
Scott -----	64	25.4	1 076	19.8	124	11.6	1 773	10.6	285	3.6	1 781	11.0
Shelby -----	365	10.2	3 346	11.4	505	8.0	4 971	8.5	1 126	2.3	5 626	4.2
Stark -----	93	16.0	846	20.5	133	13.7	1 632	15.9	348	2.6	2 801	3.9
Stephenson -----	532	7.4	10 326	5.3	840	4.4	19 072	3.7	975	3.3	3 917	3.3
Tazewell -----	228	12.6	1 792	10.9	405	9.0	8 083	7.5	870	2.6	4 872	4.3
Union -----	146	14.7	1 553	22.0	282	7.8	1 840	10.1	227	7.8	548	8.0
Vermilion -----	201	15.8	1 886	10.2	359	10.7	2 363	6.7	953	3.1	6 908	3.4
Wabash -----	29	34.0	628	23.2	82	19.3	914	13.9	203	4.5	1 943	18.2
Warren -----	321	10.6	4 520	6.3	510	7.0	6 481	6.3	710	2.5	4 747	4.0

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-17

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Washington -----	261	12.2	2 456	13.9	479	7.2	9 868	5.9	735	3.6	2 962	4.2
Wayne -----	232	14.7	1 874	9.1	452	8.4	5 131	13.2	756	4.5	3 110	6.4
White -----	111	20.0	399	18.5	230	10.2	1 318	25.2	370	4.6	2 833	7.7
Whiteside -----	527	7.6	26 052	6.1	642	6.0	15 855	7.6	947	2.9	5 163	4.3
Will -----	147	15.3	1 441	26.0	251	11.0	2 532	12.9	868	2.7	5 244	3.3
Williamson -----	119	21.1	790	25.3	188	15.3	749	24.6	240	9.1	681	14.7
Winnebago -----	249	12.3	6 831	10.7	368	7.4	4 389	11.1	560	3.3	2 907	5.5
Woodford -----	293	11.2	4 108	7.9	477	7.1	8 345	14.3	805	2.4	4 783	5.5
Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.												
Geographic area	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois-----	62 069	1.2	645 280	1.0	63 410	1.2	439 672	1.0	74 895	1.1	322 542	.9
Adams -----	1 180	3.4	7 929	5.0	1 176	3.3	4 944	5.4	1 407	2.1	4 517	3.5
Alexander -----	112	5.8	1 161	2.3	116	6.6	1 037	7.9	165	3.1	566	8.8
Bond -----	519	4.4	4 655	8.3	494	5.0	2 915	8.9	601	2.7	1 913	7.1
Boone -----	352	5.0	3 252	5.1	393	5.4	2 417	6.6	461	3.0	2 021	4.1
Brown -----	282	5.6	1 661	10.4	290	5.5	1 665	7.9	360	2.9	1 149	8.1
Bureau -----	1 102	2.7	13 298	3.3	1 183	1.8	8 950	3.6	1 225	1.9	6 967	2.7
Calhoun -----	327	8.4	1 350	10.9	344	6.5	1 037	12.6	442	3.7	780	6.6
Carroll -----	533	3.8	5 933	4.3	566	3.4	4 798	3.9	644	1.8	4 252	3.1
Cass -----	373	4.7	5 282	6.3	378	3.5	3 434	5.7	404	2.8	2 187	4.7
Champaign -----	1 294	2.2	16 676	2.9	1 310	2.2	10 660	3.7	1 415	1.3	6 297	2.5
Christian -----	747	2.9	11 955	4.4	764	2.8	7 298	3.0	874	1.4	4 892	3.0
Clark -----	518	4.7	6 230	4.8	524	5.0	4 278	6.3	662	2.3	3 062	3.6
Clay -----	532	5.1	4 921	6.3	492	5.6	3 557	11.2	657	2.1	2 266	5.9
Clinton -----	774	3.7	6 098	4.2	753	3.7	3 399	5.4	916	1.7	3 500	4.4
Coles -----	578	4.6	8 211	11.1	616	4.0	4 471	5.0	679	2.4	3 182	4.2
Cook -----	158	8.0	864	20.6	155	11.5	749	23.3	235	6.1	1 177	6.8
Crawford -----	459	4.9	5 989	6.7	422	5.5	3 723	5.8	542	1.8	2 837	4.7
Cumberland -----	547	4.3	4 306	6.1	574	3.3	2 563	9.8	627	2.2	2 282	7.0
De Kalb -----	796	2.5	11 224	3.5	809	2.5	8 367	2.8	913	1.6	6 175	2.9
De Witt -----	450	3.5	6 066	7.6	437	3.8	4 379	6.9	489	1.6	2 446	9.0
Douglas -----	513	4.1	6 855	8.3	550	4.2	4 476	8.6	648	2.7	3 062	4.4
Du Page -----	61	4.7	447	4.2	72	4.2	271	2.8	92	2.1	715	1.2
Edgar -----	660	4.4	8 327	4.0	692	3.9	5 920	4.8	809	1.9	4 103	4.8
Edwards -----	280	6.1	2 127	9.8	247	7.8	1 247	9.3	323	1.5	1 074	9.0
Effingham -----	964	3.1	6 761	5.5	978	2.9	3 835	5.7	1 079	1.9	3 433	5.9
Fayette -----	892	4.3	6 970	4.5	874	3.9	4 024	5.2	1 121	2.0	3 707	5.0
Ford -----	571	2.8	6 517	5.7	574	2.6	4 874	5.5	603	1.5	3 203	4.2
Franklin -----	360	7.4	3 110	10.2	319	9.5	2 098	9.3	503	3.3	1 333	7.3
Fulton -----	872	3.7	8 283	4.3	919	3.6	4 994	4.4	1 121	1.9	4 342	3.8
Gallatin -----	212	6.8	5 547	4.6	220	5.6	3 504	3.9	231	3.7	1 851	4.1
Greene -----	583	4.8	6 441	7.6	619	5.0	3 943	5.9	783	1.7	3 104	5.5
Grundy -----	493	3.2	5 850	6.0	499	2.9	4 137	5.5	525	2.2	3 265	6.6
Hamilton -----	379	5.5	4 550	6.6	332	6.8	2 317	6.2	447	2.5	1 597	7.1
Hancock -----	933	4.1	7 959	3.7	981	3.5	5 119	4.4	1 161	1.7	4 448	4.2
Hardin -----	61	12.2	150	13.7	77	10.0	96	11.7	154	3.8	180	8.5
Henderson -----	376	4.4	4 836	6.9	410	3.4	3 555	3.9	446	2.7	2 482	5.9
Henry -----	1 237	2.6	12 345	3.5	1 278	2.3	8 753	3.7	1 401	1.4	6 960	4.1
Iroquois -----	1 345	2.4	16 955	4.9	1 322	2.4	10 690	3.3	1 465	1.6	7 487	3.2
Jackson -----	466	4.8	2 590	6.9	439	5.6	2 178	6.5	624	2.1	1 683	4.8
Jasper -----	662	3.8	5 367	6.1	615	4.6	3 590	5.5	758	1.9	3 041	3.9
Jefferson -----	623	5.5	4 041	7.4	598	5.6	2 217	6.5	871	1.8	1 747	5.3
Jersey -----	469	4.6	3 909	6.6	427	4.8	2 518	8.9	529	3.0	1 984	13.7
Jo Daviess -----	698	4.6	5 035	6.2	757	3.6	2 366	6.4	949	1.2	3 422	3.5
Johnson -----	234	10.2	1 221	16.6	202	11.8	585	25.3	378	3.6	669	12.0
Kane -----	488	5.6	5 900	7.0	554	4.8	4 147	6.7	678	2.1	3 874	3.3
Kankakee -----	769	3.2	8 723	4.0	789	3.5	6 151	4.1	901	1.9	5 054	3.1
Kendall -----	391	4.7	4 031	5.3	419	4.0	2 910	5.4	488	2.0	2 467	7.1
Knox -----	804	3.7	8 423	4.9	888	3.0	6 373	4.1	1 019	1.0	4 804	4.2
Lake -----	216	10.1	1 282	5.5	260	8.2	899	8.8	364	2.5	1 133	3.1
La Salle -----	1 510	2.2	16 374	4.6	1 539	2.1	12 131	4.0	1 643	1.4	7 534	2.9
Lawrence -----	270	6.6	4 333	4.7	262	7.4	2 954	6.6	344	3.5	2 072	5.9
Lee -----	897	2.8	11 628	3.5	908	2.8	8 571	2.6	974	1.8	5 550	3.3
Livingston -----	1 362	2.3	13 491	4.7	1 412	2.1	9 536	3.9	1 485	1.8	7 059	4.0
Logan -----	720	3.0	9 517	4.1	760	2.5	7 878	3.6	821	1.8	4 555	4.0
McDonough -----	729	4.8	6 343	4.0	807	3.6	5 266	4.7	892	1.8	3 896	4.6
McHenry -----	590	5.1	5 888	6.0	757	4.1	4 677	6.2	948	2.0	3 917	3.8
McLean -----	1 410	2.0	19 260	3.0	1 447	2.0	14 597	3.2	1 572	1.4	8 037	3.0
Macon -----	673	2.8	8 919	4.9	710	2.6	5 359	4.1	756	1.5	3 657	4.8
Macoupin -----	1 020	3.5	9 548	5.4	1 035	3.5	5 725	4.4	1 255	2.3	4 374	4.1

See footnotes at end of table.

C-18 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Madison -----	959	2.8	8 061	4.3	987	3.4	5 863	6.1	1 238	1.6	3 651	3.5
Marion -----	647	4.2	4 586	7.3	602	4.8	2 750	8.7	833	2.0	2 089	6.0
Marshall -----	433	3.8	5 215	5.9	475	2.2	3 870	8.4	519	1.3	2 535	4.8
Mason -----	430	3.2	9 903	6.2	442	4.3	4 763	6.4	484	1.0	3 524	5.1
Massac -----	278	6.1	1 961	9.4	292	6.7	1 234	13.2	373	4.0	952	8.0
Menard -----	289	4.9	4 399	8.3	303	4.8	3 279	9.0	362	2.4	1 817	7.0
Mercer -----	585	3.9	7 142	5.3	671	3.4	4 839	5.7	791	1.5	3 721	4.2
Monroe -----	449	5.2	3 215	4.3	405	6.1	2 314	5.8	559	2.7	1 878	3.1
Montgomery -----	919	3.0	9 015	7.0	889	3.5	6 443	7.4	1 035	2.5	4 313	3.7
Morgan -----	675	4.5	7 349	4.7	631	5.1	4 822	5.8	844	1.8	3 420	5.6
Moultrie -----	399	5.0	5 599	15.7	450	3.7	2 767	6.0	461	3.1	2 057	3.9
Ogle -----	831	3.2	9 836	3.3	974	2.6	6 976	3.1	1 117	1.2	6 153	3.3
Peoria -----	732	4.0	5 720	4.9	801	2.9	4 587	4.4	957	1.2	3 203	4.9
Perry -----	469	4.0	2 582	6.6	396	6.7	1 703	8.7	535	1.8	1 121	7.4
Piatt -----	460	3.6	6 620	3.3	471	3.1	4 634	3.5	493	2.4	2 621	8.2
Pike -----	841	4.6	7 655	4.1	864	4.4	5 283	5.2	1 043	2.5	4 332	3.6
Pope -----	148	11.3	616	14.4	105	15.9	237	26.0	232	4.2	450	12.7
Pulaski -----	144	11.9	1 169	7.8	183	7.3	1 036	13.9	218	1.4	797	12.1
Putnam -----	163	8.4	2 254	20.6	164	8.9	1 293	11.1	200	1.8	1 268	9.0
Randolph -----	691	4.4	4 472	6.0	745	3.8	2 781	6.7	896	1.8	2 173	5.9
Richland -----	454	4.2	3 850	6.1	443	5.3	2 503	7.8	502	3.6	1 990	5.7
Rock Island -----	478	4.3	4 042	5.9	463	5.7	2 541	6.1	614	2.0	2 486	4.5
St. Clair -----	776	3.6	5 792	5.5	767	3.9	4 329	5.5	899	2.4	3 117	3.5
Saline -----	344	6.5	3 574	9.8	277	9.5	1 952	10.5	391	4.4	1 256	7.6
Sangamon -----	837	3.6	11 879	2.7	855	3.6	8 189	4.6	989	2.0	4 673	3.5
Schuylerville -----	360	6.2	2 296	7.1	392	5.3	1 872	9.7	440	4.3	1 388	13.5
Scott -----	258	7.9	3 170	17.9	291	5.1	2 516	15.9	327	3.3	1 604	6.3
Shelby -----	1 137	2.9	9 619	4.4	1 019	3.4	5 126	5.0	1 209	2.4	4 817	3.8
Stark -----	323	3.6	4 156	5.3	355	2.2	3 535	4.0	362	1.3	2 007	3.6
Stephenson -----	970	3.4	6 889	3.6	1 035	2.9	5 069	5.2	1 149	1.8	5 568	3.2
Tazewell -----	800	3.3	9 747	4.6	847	3.1	6 252	4.4	981	1.3	4 257	3.4
Union -----	340	6.0	1 179	6.9	297	6.6	1 151	7.0	470	2.1	894	8.3
Vermilion -----	926	3.0	12 938	3.8	917	3.4	8 207	4.2	1 089	1.5	5 526	4.2
Wabash -----	209	3.5	2 511	9.6	199	6.5	2 185	9.4	225	3.2	1 495	11.3
Warren -----	653	3.8	8 233	5.3	742	2.6	6 358	6.6	792	1.4	3 556	3.7
Washington -----	712	3.8	7 468	4.0	737	3.8	5 168	5.2	820	1.8	3 165	3.1
Wayne -----	776	4.4	6 641	5.4	723	4.8	3 688	4.0	900	2.9	3 167	5.3
White -----	381	4.2	6 541	6.4	347	6.2	4 729	12.6	448	1.5	2 248	4.0
Whiteside -----	918	3.3	10 261	4.1	953	3.1	7 039	5.5	1 104	1.5	5 387	4.3
Will -----	825	3.4	8 406	6.8	849	3.1	6 453	7.5	985	1.9	4 700	4.6
Williamson -----	306	8.2	877	20.5	295	7.9	563	22.3	500	3.2	801	7.4
Winnebago -----	577	4.6	4 214	4.7	620	3.3	4 189	10.3	723	1.3	3 200	5.8
Woodford -----	741	3.6	6 709	6.4	793	2.7	5 461	5.4	907	2.0	3 820	5.7
Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois-----	60 437	1.1	89 416	1.0	25 398	1.5	300 090	.8	4 691	3.4	15 302	5.3
Adams-----	1 212	3.3	1 588	3.8	426	9.2	3 572	8.2	38	34.1	281	14.4
Alexander-----	112	6.1	118	20.7	65	9.5	898	11.0	17	28.6	45	18.6
Bond-----	504	5.9	730	7.3	140	16.3	1 434	16.1	20	64.7	57	45.2
Boone-----	384	5.6	610	9.0	128	13.6	2 709	8.4	25	27.7	122	27.2
Brown-----	242	9.0	346	11.0	96	14.9	801	17.6	22	42.3	28	31.5
Bureau-----	1 065	3.2	3 016	3.0	451	7.7	10 970	1.2	29	36.3	146	50.8
Calhoun-----	295	9.0	284	8.0	91	21.0	775	8.1	32	39.5	22	66.2
Carroll-----	574	3.7	1 185	4.1	268	10.1	2 140	3.8	39	28.9	139	23.4
Cass-----	366	4.4	726	6.2	171	11.6	3 993	5.1	37	22.2	(D)	(D)
Champaign-----	1 111	3.3	1 373	4.5	432	8.5	4 366	4.5	135	19.4	512	7.4
Christian-----	715	3.8	1 289	4.5	354	9.4	5 000	4.0	75	28.0	302	28.5
Clark-----	470	5.4	629	6.5	206	12.9	1 516	5.4	45	32.8	127	21.3
Clay-----	493	5.3	550	17.7	158	14.7	709	14.6	35	45.5	18	39.4
Clinton-----	730	4.1	1 730	5.7	331	9.1	4 793	6.5	30	30.0	656	2
Coles-----	534	5.3	533	9.4	243	11.4	1 784	8.3	36	29.9	63	45.0
Cook-----	156	10.5	321	7.7	87	20.8	5 687	1.9	50	35.4	398	66.6
Crawford-----	432	5.5	550	8.7	171	13.7	1 908	12.5	22	40.1	38	42.2
Cumberland-----	454	5.5	558	8.9	181	16.3	1 175	20.1	23	53.3	60	44.9
De Kalb-----	804	3.1	1 606	3.2	348	7.7	5 670	2.0	43	26.4	374	25.5
De Witt-----	365	6.0	503	6.0	179	12.9	1 272	6.9	21	43.0	163	12.3
Douglas-----	451	6.4	630	6.5	249	9.9	2 432	13.1	42	34.6	57	7.1
Du Page-----	80	5.0	429	1.4	33	13.0	5 969	.5	6	6.7	200	.1
Edgar-----	661	4.4	964	5.6	350	10.2	2 676	7.8	70	29.2	148	49.4
Edwards-----	265	7.7	307	10.9	82	21.5	488	4.1	5	4.5	20	2.3

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_869 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 4/12/94 8:44 AM MACHINE: EPCV23 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_33.TIPS;1 * 4/8/94 12:56:00 TAPE: NO reel FRAME: 13 TIPS:TIPS92-12562648.DAT;1 4/8/94 12:56:33 UTF:TIPS93-12562648.DAT;1 4/8/94 12:56:33 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_33.DAT;3 4/8/94 12:57:26

APPENDIX C C-19

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Effingham -----	891	3.8	1 260	6.1	266	13.7	1 638	14.0	43	35.3	92	59.9
Fayette -----	746	5.3	1 125	4.9	281	11.3	3 157	3.9	30	40.6	113	23.7
Ford -----	466	4.6	694	5.2	253	10.2	2 957	6.4	33	35.0	114	51.8
Franklin -----	326	8.0	327	12.4	130	17.9	891	9.4	22	42.3	44	26.7
Fulton -----	845	4.5	912	5.5	350	10.2	2 534	6.9	56	30.5	145	13.0
Gallatin -----	193	9.2	491	3.5	133	12.7	2 425	3.7	25	47.8	84	3.4
Greene -----	638	4.1	931	6.8	264	10.7	2 621	10.3	45	25.8	79	36.0
Grundy -----	465	3.7	715	7.6	228	10.1	1 441	10.9	52	28.1	59	18.5
Hamilton -----	343	5.8	347	10.6	142	14.2	1 115	14.1	41	41.5	78	53.5
Hancock -----	873	4.7	1 186	5.4	428	7.6	2 271	7.0	55	28.2	112	30.1
Hardin -----	98	8.0	39	13.0	46	14.7	96	16.3	9	41.8	13	26.1
Henderson -----	415	3.4	749	7.2	163	9.7	1 627	14.8	44	25.6	77	30.6
Henry -----	1 264	2.8	1 896	4.6	514	8.0	4 713	5.9	106	23.6	229	34.3
Iroquois -----	1 255	2.9	2 124	3.7	547	7.1	7 872	3.8	114	22.2	299	20.1
Jackson -----	422	7.2	387	8.8	235	13.1	1 805	7.4	26	43.3	26	34.7
Jasper -----	590	4.5	878	5.3	179	11.8	1 446	6.3	34	30.6	37	27.5
Jefferson -----	584	6.2	386	9.6	139	18.4	879	10.4	22	33.3	70	9.7
Jersey -----	424	5.2	556	10.3	170	15.2	1 339	18.1	38	38.1	37	40.8
Jo Daviess -----	867	2.5	1 779	3.6	303	10.2	2 998	8.7	38	32.2	85	51.9
Johnson -----	279	7.1	216	16.2	113	16.9	408	9.0	26	48.7	43	26.8
Kane -----	583	3.8	1 001	5.7	224	11.4	10 052	.9	21	32.0	206	1.5
Kankakee -----	740	3.9	1 219	5.5	345	9.5	8 613	3.8	93	23.0	796	22.5
Kendall -----	386	5.5	592	6.3	114	16.2	1 987	5.0	17	42.7	68	9.2
Knox -----	764	4.6	1 434	6.0	388	9.3	5 476	4.7	43	27.9	255	8.4
Lake -----	269	8.4	478	9.6	144	16.9	7 871	.9	20	2.8	106	1.0
La Salle -----	1 429	2.8	1 773	4.7	560	7.8	4 538	8.7	125	20.8	287	32.3
Lawrence -----	279	6.7	413	8.4	121	15.7	1 517	5.8	49	30.2	127	57.2
Lee -----	833	3.8	1 276	5.8	358	9.9	2 651	15.3	48	34.0	91	12.3
Livingston -----	1 367	2.3	1 808	4.8	600	7.8	3 465	3.0	102	24.4	340	42.1
Logan -----	693	4.0	917	5.2	406	8.2	3 565	5.7	76	27.2	135	17.2
McDonough -----	671	5.1	867	4.6	270	9.8	2 339	9.7	57	32.5	108	15.9
McHenry -----	768	3.7	1 726	5.8	345	8.9	12 551	5.0	126	20.9	1 109	54.9
McLean -----	1 310	2.9	1 603	3.6	654	6.2	5 225	6.2	85	23.4	205	42.6
Macon -----	620	4.3	789	5.4	348	8.4	3 346	7.3	49	29.7	246	39.7
Macoupin -----	998	4.1	1 465	4.7	373	9.8	3 753	9.4	60	27.7	245	9.5
Madison -----	983	3.5	1 159	4.7	414	8.5	6 077	4.6	77	26.0	256	15.0
Marion -----	554	6.2	618	8.0	179	16.1	1 437	25.1	74	26.9	59	27.9
Marshall -----	418	4.6	365	8.3	178	13.9	1 177	15.1	30	40.8	160	16.7
Mason -----	406	5.1	1 320	7.9	237	10.3	2 732	4.4	5	6.4	33	24.1
Massac -----	260	8.0	240	11.7	139	15.5	745	15.0	24	44.1	11	43.5
Menard -----	320	5.4	508	5.9	151	11.2	2 450	11.0	34	34.5	57	48.4
Mercer -----	677	3.2	1 229	10.2	303	10.6	2 153	13.5	17	50.2	19	48.9
Monroe -----	454	4.8	656	4.5	156	12.8	2 105	5.6	23	35.5	132	4.4
Montgomery -----	872	3.7	1 388	6.1	327	11.5	2 900	9.0	72	33.1	249	37.9
Morgan -----	703	4.0	1 117	6.5	318	10.5	2 876	13.0	67	24.7	120	27.3
Moultrie -----	403	5.5	417	6.6	190	11.3	1 474	6.2	34	32.3	56	17.8
Ogle -----	977	2.8	1 447	3.7	335	9.2	2 511	3.7	50	29.4	121	22.3
Peoria -----	755	4.0	570	7.6	292	10.7	3 026	9.3	76	26.5	144	33.4
Perry -----	336	8.9	283	12.1	98	18.8	627	37.1	15	55.6	24	61.1
Piatt -----	404	4.0	652	6.1	200	11.7	1 772	6.0	43	31.3	67	20.1
Pike -----	884	4.2	1 289	5.0	346	9.3	3 725	5.2	101	22.6	168	16.8
Pope -----	147	11.3	115	28.0	75	21.8	188	31.2	33	41.0	54	50.1
Pulaski -----	132	14.2	206	17.7	108	16.2	855	24.7	22	51.3	36	27.0
Putnam -----	171	6.9	334	7.0	52	26.6	3 867	3.4	2	—	(D)	(D)
Randolph -----	632	5.0	589	8.8	226	14.2	1 247	12.9	33	52.9	77	55.7
Richland -----	397	5.4	518	6.6	140	14.6	1 337	7.6	36	30.7	116	48.8
Rock Island -----	489	5.1	658	4.3	145	15.2	1 680	12.9	34	39.2	34	11.4
St. Clair -----	711	4.0	906	7.5	263	13.4	2 695	5.1	53	34.6	216	18.6
Saline -----	286	9.0	246	12.2	95	22.8	874	12.4	45	35.1	31	33.7
Sangamon -----	808	3.9	1 259	3.4	409	8.2	5 923	3.6	87	23.0	301	8.0
Schuylerville -----	367	6.7	441	9.8	121	18.1	1 765	34.8	7	81.1	7	82.3
Scott -----	263	7.5	317	8.0	151	15.7	1 236	8.8	16	62.3	26	15.2
Shelby -----	1 027	3.8	1 327	5.6	381	8.8	1 865	7.8	77	26.8	224	32.2
Stark -----	320	4.7	371	5.9	138	12.2	930	3.7	5	—	10	—
Stephenson -----	1 078	2.6	2 897	3.5	418	8.1	5 200	5.1	74	30.3	209	36.3
Tazewell -----	810	3.4	977	5.1	391	9.0	3 948	10.0	48	31.3	89	14.5
Union -----	292	8.8	233	7.6	188	14.9	2 845	1.9	7	—	13	—
Vermilion -----	886	3.8	1 060	4.7	422	8.8	3 170	6.0	102	22.3	245	18.7
Wabash -----	204	5.9	257	12.6	83	17.8	482	7.0	20	43.9	59	16.7
Warren -----	711	3.2	1 096	6.5	342	10.0	2 715	12.6	51	33.8	142	47.1
Washington -----	626	5.4	1 157	4.4	261	10.4	2 896	4.9	55	33.4	144	18.3
Wayne -----	738	4.4	743	6.1	266	11.4	1 788	9.7	61	23.9	119	31.3
White -----	377	3.3	488	5.3	135	17.3	1 874	4.0	61	33.0	140	48.8
Whiteside -----	941	3.0	1 728	6.7	423	8.9	3 819	9.9	77	25.2	301	11.8
Will -----	770	4.2	1 023	5.4	287	10.5	8 221	5.5	41	27.3	126	11.1
Williamson -----	355	5.9	189	6.8	93	17.6	455	30.0	62	28.1	22	30.5
Winnebago -----	592	4.9	1 010	6.5	238	12.7	2 443	4.8	45	31.9	84	56.0
Woodford -----	732	4.2	1 079	7.7	310	10.6	4 065	7.0	68	30.1	64	36.8

See footnotes at end of table.

C-20 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois	66 831	1.1	375 501	1.0	32 690	1.4	100 931	2.1	42 731	1.3	431 344	1.1
Adams	1 217	3.3	5 049	3.9	557	7.7	1 447	11.4	768	5.6	6 893	6.4
Alexander	152	4.2	721	9.6	53	12.5	161	19.6	95	7.3	842	8.5
Bond	581	3.5	3 103	12.4	297	11.8	470	21.4	374	7.8	3 177	13.5
Boone	413	5.2	2 608	6.9	257	8.8	775	12.2	275	8.4	2 860	9.1
Brown	322	4.7	1 393	7.9	174	13.6	370	12.6	260	7.0	2 213	9.2
Bureau	1 141	2.5	9 182	7.4	717	5.8	2 239	10.6	842	4.6	9 215	5.3
Calhoun	374	5.5	1 110	13.5	138	19.0	233	16.3	181	14.2	1 231	14.3
Carroll	629	2.2	4 034	4.2	366	7.2	946	12.3	427	6.6	6 201	4.5
Cass	374	4.0	3 097	5.1	200	11.2	(D)	(D)	238	8.0	2 982	8.0
Champaign	1 224	2.6	7 844	3.9	668	6.1	2 484	11.3	929	4.4	9 878	5.4
Christian	729	3.8	5 662	5.3	422	8.4	1 436	10.9	583	4.9	6 662	5.1
Clark	544	4.7	3 528	10.3	246	10.8	988	25.9	349	8.2	3 395	9.8
Clay	597	3.5	2 187	7.4	185	14.6	231	23.9	364	7.4	2 790	10.4
Clinton	814	3.1	4 671	5.4	391	8.6	832	12.1	491	7.9	4 316	7.8
Coles	570	4.7	3 761	7.5	321	9.9	613	14.2	402	7.8	3 782	10.5
Cook	241	4.4	1 706	4.3	15	4.5	81	8.1	111	18.7	898	18.5
Crawford	471	4.6	3 152	5.3	210	12.6	336	14.7	335	7.6	3 789	10.1
Cumberland	579	3.2	2 781	5.6	254	13.1	476	29.7	323	7.8	1 869	11.3
De Kalb	825	2.8	6 464	3.8	538	5.6	2 636	10.7	635	4.8	10 252	4.5
De Witt	382	4.8	2 400	9.0	248	10.0	1 104	21.8	312	6.9	3 062	9.4
Douglas	635	2.2	3 650	9.2	291	11.0	798	18.9	408	7.9	4 319	9.2
Du Page	80	3.3	621	4.7	14	24.6	21	6.8	41	10.9	494	4.4
Edgar	708	3.1	4 439	5.5	401	9.3	724	12.4	477	6.9	5 316	7.1
Edwards	286	3.8	1 234	8.3	119	18.2	292	33.2	185	12.2	1 101	9.6
Effingham	1 008	2.9	3 911	6.5	406	10.2	598	18.5	533	8.0	3 237	16.0
Fayette	945	3.6	3 986	5.6	251	13.6	896	39.8	596	6.9	4 624	8.0
Ford	548	3.4	3 673	5.8	223	11.7	1 121	14.4	384	7.4	4 719	8.8
Franklin	475	4.2	1 315	7.3	204	12.5	710	12.3	260	9.7	1 732	9.0
Fulton	1 051	2.8	5 183	5.0	478	8.8	1 292	13.2	629	6.5	6 226	6.1
Gallatin	214	6.5	2 290	5.6	114	18.1	430	9.6	146	15.9	2 214	6.2
Greene	674	3.7	4 002	5.9	266	12.8	779	23.0	380	8.2	4 064	9.3
Grundy	476	3.4	2 900	6.7	221	11.7	543	16.4	336	8.3	3 710	13.1
Hamilton	376	4.2	1 996	5.8	178	13.6	350	17.5	242	9.8	2 209	17.9
Hancock	984	3.6	5 340	4.5	461	9.2	865	14.6	649	5.6	6 704	7.9
Hardin	133	5.3	251	11.8	43	15.5	36	23.8	54	12.4	139	16.0
Henderson	410	4.1	2 829	12.0	240	8.8	1 087	16.0	343	5.2	4 312	8.4
Henry	1 338	2.1	8 330	4.5	767	5.9	2 336	14.7	865	5.2	10 449	7.0
Iroquois	1 301	2.6	8 962	4.0	658	6.7	3 294	13.2	917	4.5	10 848	5.4
Jackson	515	4.7	1 803	7.7	180	14.3	581	58.4	245	11.2	2 215	16.4
Jasper	691	3.2	3 402	4.9	285	11.2	651	19.6	452	6.6	4 258	11.4
Jefferson	740	3.9	2 267	12.1	217	14.8	277	13.0	398	9.2	1 735	12.0
Jersey	412	6.1	1 932	5.8	183	11.8	582	20.8	219	11.8	2 581	10.7
Jo Daviess	834	3.1	4 568	6.2	451	7.2	1 146	12.6	486	6.9	4 646	6.9
Johnson	362	4.4	861	9.3	152	16.5	344	24.1	149	15.3	600	14.0
Kane	604	3.6	3 567	4.9	305	9.5	1 103	9.0	328	8.2	3 915	8.2
Kankakee	795	3.1	5 463	6.3	416	8.8	1 376	14.1	479	7.6	5 273	7.5
Kendall	448	3.5	2 939	7.3	157	13.9	402	22.3	267	9.4	3 022	8.8
Knox	857	3.1	5 377	4.0	546	7.0	2 326	11.8	617	6.0	7 368	8.7
Lake	307	5.1	1 550	4.4	111	20.8	290	8.6	125	19.0	1 320	8.4
La Salle	1 475	2.6	8 544	6.7	844	5.8	3 765	15.8	943	5.1	9 440	6.4
Lawrence	277	7.2	2 031	7.3	114	18.2	260	20.8	161	11.2	3 468	15.7
Lee	922	2.4	6 139	4.5	520	7.8	2 087	9.4	678	5.2	8 043	4.5
Livingston	1 391	2.2	8 398	5.1	636	7.4	1 788	14.1	884	5.4	7 253	7.0
Logan	767	2.6	4 678	4.2	344	10.1	1 081	13.3	620	4.0	5 521	7.4
McDonough	770	4.0	4 266	5.8	499	7.3	1 218	9.7	520	6.4	4 948	7.3
McHenry	815	3.7	5 127	6.9	341	10.2	1 769	17.2	409	8.7	5 003	4.6
McLean	1 347	2.6	8 777	3.7	830	5.3	4 424	11.2	982	4.3	10 413	5.6
Macon	637	3.9	4 018	6.8	299	10.5	1 081	13.9	400	6.9	4 332	7.6
Macoupin	1 045	3.8	5 627	4.6	437	9.1	1 034	13.2	692	6.0	6 809	7.7
Madison	1 176	2.2	5 054	5.5	437	9.1	652	12.9	639	5.8	4 493	8.3
Marion	718	3.7	2 805	10.0	219	14.5	247	20.7	379	9.6	2 171	13.6
Marshall	456	4.0	2 904	11.5	310	8.2	1 092	18.4	329	7.8	2 881	7.3
Mason	418	5.1	3 733	5.3	228	11.7	889	9.7	299	6.3	4 535	9.3
Massac	319	6.6	1 218	10.6	150	14.7	289	25.8	202	11.1	1 459	12.4
Menard	294	5.9	2 429	10.0	146	13.8	621	17.0	227	9.3	2 505	9.8
Mercer	691	3.2	3 799	6.8	411	6.8	1 714	11.6	495	6.1	5 646	5.6
Monroe	523	4.0	2 371	3.9	182	12.2	449	15.7	269	10.2	2 780	9.1
Montgomery	985	2.7	5 024	4.7	455	8.8	1 499	39.7	747	5.3	6 353	10.3
Morgan	753	2.8	4 088	6.3	395	9.2	1 380	14.9	496	7.7	4 813	7.4
Moultrie	425	4.8	2 439	6.3	289	8.2	741	17.2	301	7.4	3 615	7.7
Ogle	999	2.8	5 376	3.6	521	6.7	1 948	8.8	768	4.6	9 597	5.0
Peoria	831	3.4	3 437	7.1	355	9.0	1 068	19.7	443	7.9	4 694	6.5
Perry	463	5.1	1 388	7.4	90	26.5	164	40.6	208	14.0	1 141	15.1
Piatt	447	4.2	3 535	8.7	258	9.5	1 486	13.0	285	8.0	3 898	8.6
Pike	896	4.5	4 971	4.6	566	7.6	1 271	8.9	678	6.2	7 283	7.1
Pope	224	5.1	425	11.5	120	15.0	156	30.3	66	22.1	405	27.5
Pulaski	200	5.8	1 010	15.9	94	18.7	359	36.3	109	16.1	1 264	9.6
Putnam	179	6.2	1 680	13.1	106	16.2	(D)	(D)	111	13.9	1 696	12.1
Randolph	827	2.9	2 922	7.7	324	11.3	594	23.9	432	7.8	3 327	10.0

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-21

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Richland -----	495	3.0	2 553	9.7	222	12.6	516	12.4	331	7.3	3 518	8.5
Rock Island -----	544	4.5	2 359	5.8	302	9.7	763	16.2	270	9.8	2 451	9.9
St. Clair -----	852	3.3	4 127	5.3	314	11.8	694	20.0	421	8.4	3 215	10.0
Saline -----	373	5.4	1 442	8.6	166	15.9	216	21.4	180	13.9	1 480	12.5
Sangamon -----	928	2.7	6 072	4.8	472	7.5	2 134	18.5	572	6.0	6 745	5.6
Schuyler -----	420	3.8	1 833	7.7	238	12.5	312	14.9	224	11.9	1 448	10.5
Scott -----	292	5.8	1 920	19.3	145	15.0	526	21.6	151	14.9	1 382	13.8
Shelby -----	995	3.7	5 426	5.3	598	7.7	1 331	13.4	742	5.5	6 326	7.1
Stark -----	312	4.1	2 015	7.5	257	6.3	1 117	9.8	221	7.6	3 174	7.0
Stephenson -----	1 055	2.9	7 374	4.5	631	6.6	1 500	6.8	718	5.6	7 994	5.2
Tazewell -----	883	3.0	4 629	7.1	463	8.1	1 477	18.4	459	7.1	4 701	7.0
Union -----	397	5.0	1 105	4.6	124	16.7	221	20.9	211	11.4	1 286	8.9
Vermilion -----	959	2.8	6 119	5.5	477	8.3	1 563	9.2	634	5.1	7 410	6.9
Wabash -----	200	5.7	1 717	12.2	92	16.2	398	27.9	167	9.2	1 964	10.9
Warren -----	720	3.4	4 232	3.9	363	9.1	1 273	16.5	588	4.4	6 212	9.4
Washington -----	775	2.9	4 642	4.6	292	10.2	501	13.6	450	8.1	2 993	9.9
Wayne -----	791	4.1	3 484	6.4	349	11.3	587	9.8	594	6.0	4 275	7.2
White -----	413	3.1	2 455	5.4	194	12.2	451	13.0	284	8.2	2 889	8.7
Whiteside -----	1 016	2.6	5 932	5.2	608	6.0	2 056	7.9	752	4.9	8 854	7.0
Will -----	871	3.4	5 193	4.8	341	10.3	1 057	19.4	362	9.1	3 460	6.3
Williamson -----	420	5.4	942	10.8	175	13.9	177	22.5	157	17.3	491	25.3
Winnebago -----	629	3.8	3 997	7.4	350	9.9	1 006	13.4	441	7.2	4 150	8.0
Woodford -----	835	3.3	4 622	5.9	402	8.4	1 958	16.4	526	6.4	5 481	13.4
Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois-----	25 142	1.5	422 189	1.3	65 516	1.1	153 680	1.1	73 378	1.1	469 178	.9
Adams -----	266	11.8	2 258	12.0	1 330	2.7	2 487	7.2	1 403	2.2	6 975	4.7
Alexander -----	19	26.3	457	5.5	165	3.4	249	12.1	153	4.5	965	8.9
Bond -----	208	14.5	1 950	27.8	580	3.5	751	9.4	614	2.4	2 596	7.8
Boone -----	181	10.0	4 489	12.4	421	4.1	1 129	7.0	479	2.6	3 097	6.0
Brown -----	110	15.2	1 327	22.2	356	4.1	576	17.2	379	2.1	1 751	7.1
Bureau -----	522	7.7	10 930	6.7	976	3.7	3 381	5.8	1 245	1.3	12 932	2.5
Calhoun -----	65	27.5	534	12.8	440	3.3	426	7.4	410	4.9	1 058	10.7
Carroll -----	293	7.8	7 529	5.9	518	3.6	1 889	6.5	644	1.7	5 495	3.5
Cass -----	112	14.9	2 022	9.9	365	4.6	976	7.2	410	2.1	3 569	7.1
Champaign-----	446	8.1	7 788	11.5	1 086	3.6	3 101	5.2	1 403	1.3	8 764	3.9
Christian -----	263	10.1	4 024	12.9	770	3.1	2 192	4.6	839	2.0	7 856	4.1
Clark -----	162	14.1	2 769	13.9	652	2.6	1 115	13.2	613	3.3	3 239	10.1
Clay -----	90	21.6	876	27.5	631	3.1	964	7.8	616	3.2	2 009	11.4
Clinton -----	302	11.5	3 027	9.4	793	3.9	1 168	7.2	895	1.8	6 649	5.2
Coles -----	182	11.6	2 333	17.3	600	3.3	1 463	8.2	669	2.8	3 823	6.7
Cook -----	100	16.5	1 379	15.2	190	10.8	617	14.0	234	6.1	2 220	2.4
Crawford -----	115	16.4	1 675	10.4	504	3.6	937	8.2	483	4.1	3 853	8.9
Cumberland -----	144	18.9	1 274	18.7	599	3.0	740	9.1	609	2.3	2 718	13.4
De Kalb -----	512	6.2	16 448	4.8	713	4.3	3 217	7.1	925	1.4	8 430	3.4
De Witt -----	135	15.6	3 031	15.8	384	5.7	1 177	14.8	449	3.8	2 758	10.2
Douglas -----	284	11.5	3 561	14.1	529	4.6	1 436	8.2	640	2.5	4 422	4.2
Du Page -----	33	12.3	527	2.0	73	5.2	181	7.7	88	2.3	3 262	.9
Edgar -----	301	11.0	4 698	13.3	682	4.2	1 520	8.4	799	2.2	4 292	4.7
Edwards -----	63	25.0	962	15.4	302	3.8	446	9.1	316	2.8	1 046	6.6
Effingham -----	387	9.5	3 775	15.1	1 009	2.9	1 412	5.7	1 041	2.6	4 264	5.5
Fayette -----	229	13.1	2 260	16.2	1 015	3.3	1 299	5.1	998	2.8	4 291	4.4
Ford -----	231	9.4	4 274	7.0	454	4.9	1 697	12.1	612	1.1	5 151	6.6
Franklin -----	144	16.4	1 254	25.9	498	3.5	648	8.7	495	3.3	1 876	9.1
Fulton -----	264	11.5	4 100	11.7	1 074	2.4	2 501	5.3	1 101	2.1	5 845	4.2
Gallatin -----	112	20.0	1 169	6.4	209	8.3	783	7.4	232	3.8	2 215	8.1
Greene -----	219	13.0	1 858	22.1	649	4.0	1 692	6.6	759	2.2	4 118	6.6
Grundy -----	237	8.9	6 903	12.3	352	7.6	956	11.8	519	2.2	4 370	17.7
Hamilton -----	84	22.0	1 215	8.8	457	2.3	700	11.0	424	3.2	2 416	8.4
Hancock -----	419	8.4	4 506	10.6	1 013	3.4	2 222	6.3	1 127	2.1	5 778	3.4
Hardin -----	19	22.4	52	47.1	173	2.2	77	6.2	157	3.9	211	9.9
Henderson -----	166	12.5	1 895	6.3	417	3.8	1 229	8.1	468	1.1	3 245	5.6
Henry -----	563	7.5	10 615	6.6	1 128	3.6	2 961	6.2	1 404	1.5	9 955	4.0
Iroquois -----	630	6.6	12 000	7.4	1 248	2.8	3 803	5.8	1 467	1.5	13 592	4.3
Jackson -----	154	14.7	1 089	8.1	641	2.0	868	11.9	599	3.0	2 314	12.9
Jasper -----	233	12.1	3 392	16.4	694	3.3	1 121	9.8	719	2.3	3 594	4.8
Jefferson -----	169	15.3	998	18.7	828	2.3	997	7.5	800	3.1	2 225	8.3
Jersey -----	218	12.5	1 846	10.6	453	5.2	875	6.6	502	3.2	2 354	5.9
Jo Daviess -----	345	8.8	4 140	7.7	894	2.2	1 939	5.1	910	2.1	6 620	5.4
Johnson -----	58	28.9	162	7.8	401	2.6	441	9.6	388	3.3	878	10.1

See footnotes at end of table.

C-22 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Kane -----	373	7.2	9 341	9.1	520	4.6	2 344	8.1	681	2.2	7 086	5.9
Kankakee -----	410	8.3	9 036	6.4	736	4.2	1 909	7.5	868	2.0	8 751	6.4
Kendall -----	249	9.0	4 993	7.6	375	6.2	1 421	9.2	472	2.5	3 815	5.8
Knox -----	452	7.9	6 967	6.7	878	3.5	3 261	6.5	945	2.0	6 995	5.5
Lake -----	94	12.3	1 817	7.8	325	5.0	976	7.9	351	3.3	4 452	.7
La Salle -----	637	7.5	12 026	5.9	1 263	3.6	4 051	6.7	1 627	1.5	9 341	4.8
Lawrence -----	97	14.6	1 696	9.8	333	4.3	815	9.8	349	3.2	2 010	3.8
Lee -----	548	6.7	16 711	6.2	706	5.3	2 479	6.4	984	1.6	7 545	8.1
Livingston -----	490	8.8	6 909	11.1	1 232	3.4	3 102	5.5	1 519	1.3	10 537	4.7
Logan -----	395	7.9	9 737	11.4	575	5.3	1 654	8.9	828	1.6	7 139	4.9
McDonough -----	318	9.1	5 197	6.4	783	3.5	1 773	6.1	847	3.0	4 452	4.9
McHenry -----	399	8.6	9 492	8.4	765	4.1	2 571	7.4	930	2.3	6 769	4.4
McLean -----	571	6.8	8 508	8.3	1 220	3.4	4 414	6.1	1 558	1.3	11 435	3.5
Macon -----	229	10.9	3 842	13.6	599	4.5	2 088	8.6	720	2.3	6 140	4.6
Macoupin -----	423	9.1	5 253	11.2	1 092	3.5	2 006	6.9	1 234	2.5	6 160	6.1
Madison -----	363	9.2	4 892	15.1	1 107	3.2	1 555	5.2	1 195	2.0	5 697	6.9
Marion -----	152	17.0	1 101	20.8	791	2.9	1 006	7.5	751	3.3	2 481	9.1
Marshall -----	235	10.6	3 521	15.5	408	5.8	1 282	12.9	489	2.4	3 437	10.4
Mason -----	142	16.4	2 002	13.7	385	6.4	949	8.9	479	2.2	3 966	5.1
Massac -----	78	19.8	527	39.5	367	4.0	353	9.0	365	4.9	1 112	9.2
Menard -----	106	16.5	2 304	12.7	288	6.9	639	14.7	333	4.4	3 192	9.9
Mercer -----	322	9.4	6 744	9.8	656	3.3	2 067	5.3	777	1.9	5 580	5.4
Monroe -----	130	15.7	1 113	11.4	525	3.6	922	8.6	554	2.7	2 597	4.9
Montgomery -----	348	11.5	4 659	13.6	911	3.8	1 710	9.4	1 054	2.0	5 329	5.9
Morgan -----	171	13.3	2 673	3.9	755	3.3	1 781	8.7	836	2.0	4 801	5.6
Moultrie -----	204	10.7	2 734	10.1	412	5.2	1 381	9.7	464	3.1	4 113	5.5
Ogle -----	489	6.8	14 174	4.8	957	3.0	2 755	6.6	1 090	1.8	6 333	3.6
Pearl -----	303	8.6	4 434	9.1	824	2.9	1 712	5.6	888	2.4	3 952	4.6
Perry -----	115	22.5	1 018	18.5	470	5.6	536	9.8	494	4.1	1 415	8.0
Piatt -----	179	11.0	3 893	11.5	351	6.7	1 465	9.9	502	1.8	4 285	5.0
Pike -----	248	11.9	3 200	12.5	1 000	2.8	2 055	4.2	1 000	3.1	6 369	4.6
Pope -----	33	34.4	146	29.1	246	1.9	251	15.3	223	5.2	354	11.7
Pulaski -----	64	25.3	658	16.6	210	4.3	233	10.8	199	6.1	1 202	9.5
Putnam -----	46	30.0	687	25.4	165	8.5	526	12.1	191	4.1	4 684	9.0
Randolph -----	267	12.1	1 650	12.2	841	3.3	1 034	6.6	880	2.5	3 136	6.7
Richland -----	146	14.6	1 774	12.8	537	1.9	616	7.1	504	3.3	2 633	8.8
Rock Island -----	237	11.5	3 614	10.5	524	4.7	1 305	11.6	606	2.3	3 320	5.0
St. Clair -----	298	10.8	2 819	9.7	799	3.8	1 473	6.8	887	2.6	4 346	4.0
Saline -----	76	28.6	602	6.2	415	2.7	549	13.3	399	3.9	1 346	11.1
Sangamon -----	342	8.4	8 398	11.3	893	3.1	2 857	5.4	1 012	1.7	8 946	3.6
Schuyler -----	66	29.9	459	14.3	423	5.3	701	9.4	445	2.8	2 331	10.0
Scott -----	83	22.4	1 196	31.9	282	6.6	465	11.1	337	1.4	1 691	7.4
Shelby -----	312	10.7	3 779	14.7	1 143	3.1	2 413	7.1	1 185	2.3	6 006	4.4
Stark -----	193	8.6	4 967	10.7	286	5.6	1 015	5.8	355	2.2	2 916	7.4
Stephenson -----	492	7.7	8 639	8.2	1 000	3.2	3 084	5.6	1 141	1.5	10 633	5.2
Tazewell -----	302	9.6	3 907	9.2	898	2.7	2 320	7.4	959	2.0	5 476	5.4
Union -----	89	22.3	624	19.2	467	2.5	502	6.1	431	4.1	1 716	3.9
Vermilion -----	452	7.0	8 128	11.9	962	3.1	2 539	6.0	1 095	1.3	7 414	7.2
Wabash -----	102	13.9	963	11.9	178	7.7	340	10.1	232	1.5	1 794	14.1
Warren -----	309	10.4	5 618	10.1	709	3.6	2 078	6.8	777	1.5	5 725	6.5
Washington -----	242	11.3	2 825	7.7	677	4.3	1 003	6.3	784	2.9	4 510	3.8
Wayne -----	170	17.3	1 354	15.6	927	2.4	1 340	6.5	884	2.8	3 479	7.5
White -----	101	19.0	1 452	8.0	445	1.5	789	6.0	448	1.5	3 468	7.7
Whiteside -----	425	9.3	8 812	8.3	938	3.0	2 325	5.2	1 113	1.4	7 603	5.1
Will -----	404	8.0	9 945	6.8	825	4.0	2 420	9.0	973	2.4	6 854	3.2
Williamson -----	113	20.7	284	36.1	477	4.0	460	13.5	491	3.2	953	21.8
Winnebago -----	300	11.1	5 658	9.0	591	4.8	1 518	8.6	666	3.1	3 431	5.9
Woodford -----	419	7.6	9 344	7.5	783	4.0	2 132	7.4	940	1.7	6 838	6.0
Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	Illinois-----	77 606	1.1	2 169 423	1.0	.9	24 164 457	.6	69 425	.9	21 868 287	.6
Adams -----	1 501	1.4	31 977	5.4	1 402	1.2	360 899	1.1	1 337	1.3	303 946	1.1
Alexander -----	171	2.6	4 591	5.3	166	.9	58 666	1.2	147	1.3	53 232	1.3
Bond -----	629	1.7	12 977	10.6	587	1.8	162 092	2.0	532	1.9	144 248	2.1
Boone -----	499	1.1	8 389	11.0	471	1.2	125 891	1.3	445	1.3	117 183	1.3
Brown -----	387	1.5	7 696	10.7	348	.7	91 998	.8	315	.9	76 068	.9
Bureau -----	1 273	1.0	49 273	4.1	1 190	1.1	441 470	.9	1 165	1.1	408 486	.9
Calhoun -----	462	2.3	2 010	24.5	430	1.5	59 374	1.7	402	1.6	41 921	1.8
Carroll -----	658	1.1	15 842	7.7	627	1.0	205 296	.9	600	1.0	180 750	.8
Cass -----	431	.9	20 466	8.0	395	.9	173 458	.8	377	.9	156 983	.9

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-23

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Champaign -----	1 451	.9	67 427	3.4	1 413	.8	555 113	.7	1 405	.9	529 691	.7
Christian -----	892	.9	49 629	3.7	833	1.1	373 239	.8	818	1.1	353 204	.8
Clark -----	685	1.7	20 675	7.1	651	1.6	222 170	1.4	618	1.6	203 126	1.4
Clay -----	669	1.5	11 878	11.2	631	1.6	198 512	1.7	591	1.6	179 294	1.6
Clinton -----	942	1.1	27 631	4.8	868	1.1	211 317	1.1	844	1.1	196 812	1.2
Coles -----	700	1.3	22 097	7.7	654	1.0	243 668	.8	631	1.0	220 860	.9
Cook -----	257	1.4	3 517	24.7	200	1.5	34 094	2.4	178	1.7	29 479	2.3
Crawford -----	542	1.8	18 162	6.7	512	1.8	196 153	1.2	490	1.7	183 503	1.2
Cumberland -----	645	1.2	15 619	9.5	608	1.2	157 455	1.3	590	1.3	146 369	1.3
De Kalb -----	940	1.1	24 853	6.2	891	.8	362 650	.7	879	.9	344 473	.7
De Witt -----	496	1.2	23 499	6.9	483	1.0	198 445	1.0	471	1.1	188 012	1.0
Douglas -----	683	1.3	30 933	4.6	641	1.0	250 813	.7	624	1.0	239 883	.7
Du Page -----	95	2.2	6 038	2.2	81	1.6	15 984	2.7	76	1.8	14 739	2.9
Edgar -----	822	1.7	36 796	4.5	781	1.2	327 179	.9	753	1.2	303 788	.9
Edwards -----	324	1.5	6 860	17.3	302	1.3	102 123	1.2	277	1.4	83 262	1.3
Effingham -----	1 138	1.5	21 516	7.9	1 053	1.5	223 860	1.7	1 014	1.5	204 153	1.7
Fayette -----	1 152	1.7	20 476	6.7	1 079	1.8	290 315	1.6	1 016	1.9	252 568	1.7
Ford -----	613	1.1	27 543	5.7	592	.9	288 158	.7	585	.9	274 224	.7
Franklin -----	537	1.3	6 913	15.0	504	1.2	140 392	1.3	450	1.3	112 607	1.4
Fulton -----	1 163	1.3	23 218	5.8	1 079	1.2	309 857	1.0	1 031	1.2	272 226	1.0
Gallatin -----	241	1.4	9 304	7.9	224	1.4	152 719	.9	215	1.4	140 219	.9
Greene -----	784	1.7	21 957	6.9	710	1.5	246 531	1.2	677	1.5	211 789	1.2
Grundy -----	533	1.7	15 277	8.6	507	1.9	212 558	1.5	501	1.9	201 078	1.5
Hamilton -----	470	1.3	10 550	8.7	448	1.2	179 865	1.2	415	1.3	150 391	1.2
Hancock -----	1 181	1.4	32 701	4.6	1 106	1.4	357 715	1.2	1 062	1.4	310 840	1.2
Hardin -----	175	2.1	(D)	(D)	160	1.6	22 494	2.6	124	2.2	9 049	2.8
Henderson -----	468	1.1	12 805	7.0	430	1.0	173 071	1.0	412	1.1	150 822	1.0
Henry -----	1 438	1.0	35 695	5.4	1 331	1.0	415 604	.8	1 286	1.0	371 906	.8
Iroquois -----	1 509	1.2	53 677	4.9	1 461	1.0	630 028	.8	1 445	1.0	597 863	.8
Jackson -----	664	1.0	8 221	12.2	621	1.0	148 380	1.1	573	1.1	122 851	1.2
Jasper -----	773	1.5	22 198	6.1	723	1.4	233 022	1.3	709	1.4	215 752	1.3
Jefferson -----	881	1.5	5 437	14.9	825	1.3	179 871	1.5	757	1.4	141 008	1.5
Jersey -----	558	1.6	13 961	9.1	505	1.3	140 853	1.3	487	1.4	126 485	1.3
Jo Daviess -----	957	.9	14 181	8.0	875	1.1	198 935	1.0	824	1.1	154 012	1.0
Johnson -----	414	1.3	783	87.9	390	1.2	64 289	1.8	310	1.5	34 245	2.3
Kane -----	703	1.1	16 139	7.5	650	1.1	189 874	.9	622	1.1	179 316	1.0
Kankakee -----	927	1.3	30 475	5.3	890	1.3	345 088	.9	862	1.2	326 603	1.0
Kendall -----	501	.9	10 429	14.6	473	.8	169 942	.9	461	.9	157 084	.9
Knox -----	1 021	1.0	22 103	7.2	937	1.1	318 258	.9	904	1.1	280 194	.9
Lake -----	374	1.0	(D)	(D)	353	1.0	62 854	1.3	322	1.1	53 902	1.5
La Salle -----	1 669	1.1	46 888	4.6	1 610	1.1	580 405	1.0	1 586	1.1	546 813	.9
Lawrence -----	365	1.6	12 838	7.3	331	1.4	155 431	1.0	318	1.5	141 619	1.0
Lee -----	1 007	1.1	29 089	6.0	956	1.1	389 789	.9	942	1.1	366 957	.9
Livingston -----	1 562	1.2	64 749	3.6	1 484	.9	613 330	.8	1 467	.9	584 617	.8
Logan -----	835	1.3	40 616	5.2	794	1.1	353 128	1.0	777	1.1	333 698	1.0
McDonough -----	905	1.2	32 879	4.5	826	1.4	299 416	1.2	792	1.4	265 448	1.2
McHenry -----	985	1.3	13 998	7.0	896	1.2	222 490	1.2	831	1.2	203 121	1.2
McLean -----	1 617	.9	78 649	3.4	1 543	.9	679 599	.7	1 518	.9	639 535	.7
Macon -----	771	.8	41 493	4.7	725	.8	300 370	.7	698	.8	284 701	.7
Macoupin -----	1 308	1.7	36 137	5.1	1 192	1.3	341 267	1.2	1 128	1.3	310 297	1.2
Madison -----	1 298	.9	18 233	5.4	1 198	1.0	271 442	1.1	1 116	1.0	249 677	1.1
Marion -----	862	1.6	12 126	11.6	804	1.6	208 007	1.7	747	1.7	179 897	1.7
Marshall -----	525	.9	19 313	8.4	504	1.0	181 037	1.0	489	1.0	166 281	1.0
Mason -----	489	1.0	23 323	5.6	474	1.1	260 664	.9	456	1.1	232 535	.9
Massac -----	401	1.8	2 967	13.5	365	1.8	79 335	2.0	327	1.9	59 941	2.2
Menard -----	375	1.1	15 952	8.3	345	1.2	148 611	.9	331	1.2	133 747	.9
Mercer -----	811	1.1	15 588	10.9	751	1.1	267 518	1.0	716	1.1	238 046	1.0
Monroe -----	589	1.2	12 437	5.6	534	1.2	155 153	1.1	487	1.3	137 709	1.2
Montgomery -----	1 103	1.4	31 728	6.5	1 038	1.4	337 991	1.4	1 004	1.5	311 607	1.4
Morgan -----	865	.9	29 901	9.0	787	1.1	264 799	1.0	760	1.1	239 921	1.0
Moultrie -----	491	.9	23 238	8.8	463	1.0	175 978	.9	452	1.0	167 555	.9
Ogle -----	1 140	1.0	23 515	5.4	1 066	1.2	359 628	.9	1 021	1.2	322 019	.9
Peoria -----	957	1.2	19 211	5.2	892	1.0	225 107	1.1	860	1.0	206 392	1.1
Perry -----	544	1.5	4 824	13.1	504	1.5	137 901	1.9	482	1.6	119 988	1.9
Piatt -----	510	1.1	26 031	4.7	503	.9	242 614	.8	498	.9	229 891	.8
Pike -----	1 103	1.5	27 574	5.2	1 009	1.3	335 504	.9	941	1.3	266 455	.9
Pope -----	246	1.9	(D)	(D)	231	1.2	40 399	1.7	199	1.5	22 010	2.2
Pulaski -----	218	1.4	3 432	15.8	204	1.8	72 397	1.5	184	2.0	60 330	1.5
Putnam -----	200	1.8	11 741	9.0	188	1.6	66 975	2.0	185	1.7	62 010	2.0
Randolph -----	944	1.1	10 044	10.8	874	1.2	208 751	1.1	821	1.2	176 690	1.2
Richland -----	546	1.4	12 264	10.9	516	1.4	169 570	1.2	494	1.5	155 479	1.3
Rock Island -----	631	1.0	10 094	9.3	585	1.0	145 790	1.1	559	1.1	125 835	1.1
St. Clair -----	952	1.2	23 941	5.1	873	1.1	244 673	1.1	843	1.2	230 968	1.2
Saline -----	428	2.0	9 589	14.4	413	1.3	124 245	1.4	377	1.5	108 929	1.5
Sangamon -----	1 046	.8	53 034	3.3	967	.9	413 834	.7	927	.9	390 699	.7
Schuylerville -----	491	1.4	8 177	11.0	454	1.5	139 576	1.4	436	1.6	119 043	1.4
Scott -----	337	1.4	12 612	13.1	300	1.7	103 270	1.5	282	1.7	90 180	1.5
Shelby -----	1 306	1.5	35 922	4.7	1 234	1.4	362 853	1.1	1 192	1.4	331 942	1.1
Stark -----	362	1.3	14 718	5.4	343	1.2	160 082	1.0	336	1.2	147 779	1.0
Stephenson -----	1 178	1.3	26 614	6.0	1 085	1.4	281 905	1.2	1 040	1.4	252 705	1.2

See footnotes at end of table.

C-24 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Tazewell -----	1 007	1.0	38 047	4.9	941	.8	313 429	.8	906	.8	290 548	.8
Union -----	483	1.5	1 640	21.7	464	1.0	86 060	1.2	416	1.2	55 315	1.3
Vermilion -----	1 111	1.0	47 691	4.8	1 057	1.1	463 969	.9	1 015	1.2	435 905	.9
Wabash -----	232	1.5	10 020	15.0	219	.9	106 674	1.0	212	1.0	99 451	1.0
Warren -----	809	.9	29 491	5.9	745	1.1	282 911	.9	727	1.1	254 034	.9
Washington -----	831	1.2	21 428	7.6	789	1.1	270 372	1.0	769	1.1	249 245	1.0
Wayne -----	960	1.6	14 469	7.8	904	1.4	296 599	1.2	836	1.4	250 150	1.2
White -----	448	1.5	12 633	5.9	419	1.6	206 816	.8	382	1.6	188 396	.8
Whiteside -----	1 131	1.0	31 605	9.3	1 056	1.0	360 319	.8	1 016	1.0	328 357	.8
Will -----	1 056	1.4	24 460	6.4	1 006	1.2	309 416	1.1	969	1.3	288 370	1.1
Williamson -----	538	1.1	2 293	81.8	504	.9	69 621	1.4	419	1.1	47 693	1.7
Winnebago -----	725	1.3	9 591	19.4	679	1.4	182 161	1.4	642	1.5	162 847	1.5
Woodford -----	974	1.0	32 300	5.8	891	.9	272 684	.9	868	.9	254 411	.9
Irrigated land												
Geographic area	Farms		Acres		Livestock and poultry				Cattle and calves inventory			
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois-----	2 061	.9	328 316	.6	27 405	.9	1 601 261	.7	19 392	.9	447 201	.8
Adams -----	18	5.7	2 158	1.1	723	1.3	39 225	1.2	574	1.4	14 371	1.6
Alexander -----	7	9.0	2 729	5.5	74	2.8	2 834	4.6	67	3.1	1 445	5.2
Bond -----	7	13.5	43	4.1	271	2.4	11 578	3.0	165	3.1	2 568	4.2
Boone -----	10	7.1	1 017	.8	201	2.1	12 514	2.3	75	3.8	1 187	4.9
Brown -----	3	16.3	5	19.6	216	1.3	10 197	1.5	187	1.5	(D)	(D)
Bureau -----	32	4.3	3 962	3.6	323	1.6	23 532	1.4	207	2.1	6 661	3.0
Calhoun -----	7	12.0	(D)	(D)	238	2.0	7 368	2.6	212	2.2	3 650	2.6
Carroll -----	23	5.6	5 023	3.3	354	1.4	55 909	.9	157	2.3	6 269	2.4
Cass -----	44	3.5	7 787	2.1	166	1.8	9 988	2.2	134	2.1	(D)	(D)
Champaign -----	43	3.9	8 175	2.1	176	2.1	7 703	2.3	128	2.6	2 410	3.9
Christian -----	13	7.2	240	10.9	224	2.0	6 765	2.1	178	2.3	3 059	2.0
Clark -----	18	6.6	3 789	2.3	220	2.5	5 951	3.6	181	2.7	2 385	3.2
Clay -----	2	6.6	(D)	(D)	220	2.2	7 496	2.9	193	2.4	3 817	3.3
Clinton -----	16	7.4	1 736	3.2	490	1.4	36 435	1.5	173	2.4	2 563	3.5
Coles -----	11	8.0	(D)	(D)	171	2.0	6 218	2.1	115	2.4	2 310	2.8
Cook -----	38	4.2	590	5.4	39	5.6	1 259	7.3	21	7.9	470	14.3
Crawford -----	20	6.0	3 125	1.8	155	2.8	5 675	2.6	138	2.9	2 609	3.2
Cumberland -----	7	11.9	97	13.8	202	1.9	10 268	1.8	109	2.7	1 389	3.1
De Kalb -----	7	11.0	(D)	(D)	167	1.8	34 702	.9	51	3.8	1 076	7.9
De Witt -----	5	11.1	(D)	(D)	126	2.3	3 731	3.1	111	2.5	(D)	(D)
Douglas -----	8	12.0	(D)	(D)	158	2.4	4 839	3.5	45	4.3	655	5.8
Du Page -----	20	5.7	48	10.4	9	11.0	241	17.9	5	13.9	(D)	(D)
Edgar -----	8	8.5	129	1.2	274	1.7	11 626	2.4	231	1.9	4 663	2.3
Edwards -----	5	15.6	(D)	(D)	150	2.0	6 396	3.0	128	2.3	2 630	3.5
Effingham -----	16	6.6	223	7.7	474	1.6	24 162	1.8	272	2.0	4 733	2.7
Fayette -----	16	8.9	150	15.0	507	2.3	16 729	2.4	375	2.5	5 391	2.9
Ford -----	11	8.6	1 515	20.7	92	2.6	5 824	1.0	64	2.6	1 871	1.3
Franklin -----	8	9.2	14	8.7	215	2.0	6 494	3.4	170	2.3	2 779	3.4
Fulton -----	15	8.1	(D)	(D)	554	1.5	30 988	1.4	491	1.5	12 955	1.6
Gallatin -----	21	4.6	14 159	1.0	61	3.4	3 473	3.6	56	3.5	(D)	(D)
Greene -----	17	6.2	2 288	3.6	353	1.8	19 653	1.9	299	2.0	8 354	2.1
Grundy -----	9	12.8	404	17.8	92	3.4	3 481	3.4	52	4.6	(D)	(D)
Hamilton -----	1	37.1	(D)	(D)	132	2.6	3 846	3.5	118	2.8	(D)	(D)
Hancock -----	12	8.0	1 523	6.6	532	1.6	33 890	1.6	436	1.7	12 454	1.8
Hardin -----	1	34.8	(D)	(D)	123	2.2	4 913	2.6	119	2.3	2 751	2.7
Henderson -----	43	3.8	12 277	2.7	204	1.8	19 552	2.1	174	1.9	(D)	(D)
Henry -----	32	4.9	3 386	6.6	489	1.4	42 126	1.2	292	1.8	8 372	1.6
Iroquois -----	10	8.5	1 175	7.2	339	1.5	23 832	1.3	214	1.9	4 185	2.0
Jackson -----	22	6.7	521	15.1	343	1.6	15 717	1.8	291	1.8	6 682	2.0
Jasper -----	4	17.4	(D)	(D)	239	2.0	11 928	1.8	164	2.4	3 005	2.5
Jefferson -----	14	9.2	341	22.4	416	1.7	15 045	2.0	340	1.8	6 227	2.1
Jersey -----	6	14.0	19	20.2	248	1.9	14 611	2.3	189	2.2	4 346	2.7
Jo Daviess -----	11	8.5	96	5.4	697	1.1	74 044	1.0	417	1.3	17 676	1.3
Johnson -----	7	12.6	68	14.7	263	1.7	14 530	2.3	229	1.9	5 948	2.9
Kane -----	50	3.5	1 848	1.3	142	2.3	16 013	1.2	38	5.0	601	6.1
Kankakee -----	82	3.0	17 297	1.2	146	2.7	6 324	2.7	82	3.6	1 362	6.3
Kendall -----	13	7.0	491	1.2	90	2.8	7 824	2.6	43	4.3	1 209	6.3
Knox -----	12	9.6	182	21.4	478	1.4	30 083	1.6	412	1.5	12 615	1.6
Lake -----	44	3.8	365	4.2	52	4.1	2 110	3.9	32	5.3	315	5.8
La Salle -----	26	6.3	818	11.7	302	1.8	18 759	1.5	228	2.2	5 056	3.0
Lawrence -----	27	4.2	11 566	2.0	107	2.7	3 803	3.6	77	3.3	1 272	5.5
Lee -----	51	3.6	12 003	2.6	239	1.8	23 797	1.0	117	2.6	2 796	2.7
Livingston -----	5	12.0	406	16.4	268	1.7	11 604	2.1	150	2.2	2 299	2.5
Logan -----	9	9.8	1 273	11.2	211	1.8	8 493	1.7	156	2.1	2 983	2.1

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-25

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
					Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
McDonough -----	13	9.7	126	16.4	366	1.6	22 253	1.7	319	1.8	9 622	2.0
McHenry -----	65	3.3	9 543	1.6	336	1.7	26 220	1.9	101	3.3	1 637	3.8
McLean -----	12	7.7	(D)	(D)	297	1.7	15 019	1.8	225	2.0	4 688	2.2
Macon -----	8	9.7	(D)	(D)	122	2.4	3 556	2.3	97	2.7	(D)	(D)
Macoupin -----	11	8.8	351	12.4	508	1.4	26 874	1.4	386	1.6	8 085	2.3
Madison -----	33	5.0	1 273	4.0	567	1.3	23 017	1.6	354	1.7	4 939	2.1
Marion -----	15	9.7	97	12.9	322	2.3	13 684	2.9	253	2.5	4 927	3.6
Marshall -----	16	7.1	2 446	5.7	169	2.0	9 855	2.1	150	2.2	3 942	2.3
Mason -----	211	1.7	75 855	1.2	115	2.6	7 629	2.9	93	3.0	(D)	(D)
Massac -----	15	7.3	4 311	8.2	233	2.3	10 841	2.6	202	2.5	(D)	(D)
Menard -----	10	7.0	936	3.4	143	1.9	10 831	1.6	110	2.2	(D)	(D)
Mercer -----	22	5.4	3 447	5.0	351	1.6	21 225	1.6	280	1.7	9 053	1.8
Monroe -----	16	5.8	1 448	1.8	224	2.0	10 300	2.2	155	2.5	3 064	2.9
Montgomery -----	4	12.3	13	18.1	413	1.7	15 326	1.8	311	1.8	5 027	2.2
Morgan -----	10	8.4	2 162	6.3	339	1.6	19 483	1.3	279	1.7	6 585	1.9
Moultrie -----	2	23.1	(D)	(D)	137	2.5	3 947	3.1	62	3.7	1 000	3.8
Ogle -----	24	5.6	3 669	4.0	416	1.4	46 607	1.0	231	2.0	7 624	1.8
Peoria -----	21	6.7	2 738	5.4	390	1.6	14 106	1.9	311	1.7	5 938	1.9
Perry -----	13	10.0	1 369	9.4	262	2.2	11 640	2.4	226	2.4	4 870	2.5
Piatt -----	4	15.3	220	23.7	57	3.7	3 105	4.3	46	4.0	1 253	5.3
Pike -----	10	7.4	1 478	1.8	515	1.5	32 556	1.4	439	1.5	15 222	1.5
Pope -----	2	17.6	(D)	(D)	133	2.0	7 419	2.0	124	2.1	3 419	2.4
Pulaski -----	7	9.4	556	2.9	89	2.8	5 722	3.8	76	3.1	2 382	4.1
Putnam -----	3	9.6	(D)	(D)	66	4.0	4 100	3.2	49	4.9	924	5.9
Randolph -----	7	9.1	298	8.4	529	1.4	24 427	1.7	396	1.6	7 960	2.0
Richland -----	8	9.2	54	16.8	169	2.3	5 993	2.9	125	2.8	2 212	3.8
Rock Island -----	28	5.3	3 678	4.0	271	1.7	17 598	1.6	219	1.9	5 326	2.4
St. Clair -----	33	4.9	1 346	4.4	302	1.6	9 712	2.1	175	2.3	2 399	3.2
Saline -----	5	13.9	130	30.8	162	2.4	5 776	3.7	139	2.6	2 738	3.8
Sangamon -----	19	6.7	335	7.6	334	1.6	13 748	1.8	286	1.7	5 947	2.2
Schuylerville -----	3	15.5	(D)	(D)	277	2.0	13 106	2.2	258	2.1	6 626	2.2
Scott -----	11	7.0	4 301	7.6	167	2.3	7 418	2.7	146	2.6	(D)	(D)
Shelby -----	11	8.9	287	12.5	497	1.9	20 502	2.1	375	2.0	7 698	2.6
Stark -----	2	22.3	(D)	(D)	96	2.4	3 587	2.9	80	2.7	1 545	3.4
Stephenson -----	11	10.5	432	13.1	731	1.6	74 744	1.4	186	2.6	3 366	3.0
Tazewell -----	93	2.6	22 625	2.2	270	1.6	9 712	1.9	201	1.9	4 096	2.2
Union -----	16	8.0	247	1.7	279	1.5	12 887	1.6	247	1.6	5 587	2.1
Vermilion -----	11	8.6	210	13.3	255	1.7	10 862	1.9	200	2.0	3 793	2.7
Wabash -----	4	8.9	(D)	(D)	75	2.7	3 309	3.2	55	3.4	1 145	4.2
Warren -----	1	43.3	(D)	(D)	320	1.6	23 165	1.5	263	1.8	9 108	1.8
Washington -----	12	5.5	1 068	1.4	380	1.5	25 580	1.5	186	2.3	3 580	2.3
Wayne -----	12	8.4	1 035	1.1	390	1.7	15 184	1.7	335	1.8	6 935	1.7
White -----	18	6.1	5 287	2.4	151	2.9	6 070	4.1	133	3.1	(D)	(D)
Whiteside -----	138	2.4	29 231	1.8	418	1.3	44 089	.8	165	2.2	3 953	2.2
Will -----	53	4.0	3 715	1.6	179	2.4	6 463	2.6	91	3.5	1 303	4.3
Williamson -----	5	15.1	34	20.1	270	1.6	8 270	2.5	233	1.7	4 207	2.8
Winnebago -----	32	4.9	1 504	3.2	277	1.9	24 532	1.7	138	2.7	3 243	2.8
Woodford -----	14	6.9	(D)	(D)	281	1.5	13 114	1.5	199	1.8	3 875	2.3
Livestock and poultry —Con.												
Geographic area	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	Illinois-----	1.0	151 503	.9	13 433	.9	5 641 115	.4	3 204	1.1	110 302	1.2
Adams -----	51	3.8	3 165	2.6	385	1.6	187 290	.9	75	3.7	3 654	4.6
Alexander -----	4	13.2	79	17.2	17	7.1	870	10.8	—	—	—	—
Bond -----	54	5.2	3 158	4.7	137	3.3	45 852	2.4	30	6.7	965	7.8
Boone -----	71	3.6	3 841	3.3	69	3.6	18 380	3.3	30	6.0	1 023	5.2
Brown -----	2	18.3	(D)	(D)	89	2.3	38 697	1.1	23	6.6	353	8.6
Bureau -----	23	5.6	666	5.6	277	1.7	142 146	.9	68	3.7	2 274	5.8
Calhoun -----	10	11.0	73	23.0	117	3.2	42 778	1.8	17	9.2	510	10.4
Carroll -----	73	3.4	3 559	3.2	166	2.0	74 727	1.4	31	5.2	1 129	6.3
Cass -----	2	13.8	(D)	(D)	116	2.2	104 165	.7	12	8.7	372	9.7
Champaign -----	7	10.2	367	2.7	66	3.0	23 240	1.7	25	5.8	1 355	4.9
Christian -----	9	10.5	16	9.9	148	2.5	52 402	1.9	25	5.8	1 105	7.2
Clark -----	7	14.4	149	29.4	98	3.6	32 351	1.8	17	9.8	388	23.2
Clay -----	11	9.5	39	18.9	138	2.8	29 756	2.7	24	6.2	1 305	4.7
Clinton -----	183	2.2	14 355	1.6	171	2.3	67 068	1.6	21	6.3	326	11.7
Coles -----	12	9.7	293	11.8	112	2.9	27 471	2.8	20	6.8	482	7.0
Cook -----	6	15.6	80	17.3	8	11.1	(D)	(D)	9	10.9	71	11.9
Crawford -----	10	9.2	265	9.2	77	3.2	34 450	1.2	16	8.9	526	8.9
Cumberland -----	36	3.7	2 408	2.6	125	2.4	48 973	1.8	8	12.7	330	14.9
De Kalb -----	21	6.0	1 232	4.7	188	1.6	178 469	.7	42	4.3	1 674	6.7

See footnotes at end of table.

C-26 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
De Witt -----	3	16.5	(D)	(D)	25	4.6	5 351	4.7	11	7.9	321	11.7
Douglas -----	77	3.8	1 377	4.9	98	2.9	36 845	2.1	24	6.6	586	9.5
Du Page -----	1	42.1	(D)	(D)	3	17.2	(D)	(D)	6	13.4	40	15.1
Edgar -----	6	11.0	193	3.6	111	2.9	27 041	1.7	28	6.6	666	9.4
Edwards -----	5	14.8	101	23.1	121	2.5	52 072	2.3	19	7.0	456	9.2
Effingham -----	93	2.8	5 648	2.1	255	2.1	98 008	1.5	27	5.2	1 379	4.7
Fayette -----	39	5.5	2 127	4.4	208	3.0	35 587	3.6	42	6.5	1 646	10.4
Ford -----	4	10.3	179	4.7	65	3.0	44 138	1.3	18	6.9	661	12.6
Franklin -----	7	14.0	261	12.4	100	3.3	24 179	4.0	10	9.4	194	11.4
Fulton -----	17	7.8	232	16.4	173	2.3	50 696	2.1	62	4.2	1 748	5.2
Gallatin -----	2	—	(D)	(D)	38	4.4	13 091	2.7	1	40.4	(D)	(D)
Greene -----	16	8.0	383	11.5	271	2.2	92 751	1.7	42	4.9	1 045	6.2
Grundy -----	3	15.3	(D)	(D)	41	4.6	16 141	3.7	20	6.6	392	12.0
Hamilton -----	7	11.5	(D)	(D)	79	3.4	14 408	3.6	13	7.9	473	8.3
Hancock -----	13	8.5	254	13.7	273	1.8	117 593	1.2	60	4.1	3 188	4.5
Hardin -----	—	—	—	—	15	9.5	551	14.1	2	30.3	(D)	(D)
Henderson -----	6	13.3	(D)	(D)	116	2.6	46 209	2.3	21	5.9	951	5.9
Henry -----	19	7.8	445	13.1	495	1.3	314 544	.8	119	2.9	5 287	6.0
Iroquois -----	37	4.6	1 763	4.0	150	2.1	58 891	1.4	49	4.0	1 930	6.3
Jackson -----	17	7.1	581	7.1	88	3.3	15 591	4.0	13	10.0	316	13.0
Jasper -----	26	5.2	1 780	3.2	183	1.9	114 499	.9	14	7.9	664	12.4
Jefferson -----	14	9.1	454	10.6	146	2.8	23 816	3.4	22	7.1	537	7.0
Jersey -----	17	6.2	907	5.2	141	2.5	31 899	2.6	18	7.4	561	9.0
Jo Daviess -----	255	1.9	14 189	1.7	232	1.8	62 420	1.6	68	3.3	2 352	5.0
Johnson -----	16	8.4	174	17.1	55	4.5	8 485	5.3	4	15.7	44	20.9
Kane -----	42	4.0	2 465	3.0	82	3.5	27 450	2.3	27	5.7	649	11.9
Kankakee -----	22	6.6	868	6.4	95	3.0	28 703	2.3	21	6.4	971	11.9
Kendall -----	10	9.7	273	12.1	49	3.8	24 029	2.2	21	6.3	551	8.1
Knox -----	29	5.4	627	6.0	256	1.8	177 469	.6	63	3.9	1 456	4.6
Lake -----	13	8.9	587	6.2	15	9.2	1 338	14.3	23	6.8	431	10.9
La Salle -----	20	6.6	722	6.4	134	2.6	48 693	1.7	61	3.8	2 512	6.2
Lawrence -----	13	6.9	606	3.8	61	4.0	14 341	2.6	6	14.1	137	15.5
Lee -----	23	6.1	964	5.0	147	2.2	51 737	1.8	34	5.3	974	8.3
Livingston -----	34	4.5	1 944	4.3	237	1.7	134 668	1.1	45	3.8	918	3.8
Logan -----	6	8.6	54	5.1	117	2.2	81 765	.9	33	5.2	756	5.7
McDonough -----	7	9.4	64	3.8	142	2.4	51 086	1.9	66	3.8	2 570	5.0
McHenry -----	133	2.7	6 645	2.5	97	3.2	50 540	1.8	53	4.6	972	6.4
McLean -----	22	6.5	832	5.5	159	2.2	84 753	1.3	70	3.5	3 077	5.8
Macon -----	1	37.8	(D)	(D)	64	3.3	23 462	1.9	18	7.1	862	12.2
Macoupin -----	34	5.0	1 716	3.8	280	1.9	148 170	1.0	72	3.7	5 843	2.0
Madison -----	73	3.4	4 620	2.5	195	2.2	54 335	1.9	44	4.6	1 051	6.3
Marion -----	27	6.9	875	8.3	104	3.7	21 203	4.0	24	7.1	661	9.5
Marshall -----	7	12.5	215	10.9	58	4.1	17 731	4.2	25	6.5	720	9.3
Mason -----	2	17.5	(D)	(D)	59	3.4	45 174	1.0	13	8.2	470	10.4
Massac -----	2	20.8	(D)	(D)	70	4.5	15 136	4.6	5	19.7	168	20.0
Menard -----	4	10.4	(D)	(D)	57	2.7	49 812	.6	21	5.3	587	8.6
Mercer -----	8	11.7	366	11.0	220	1.9	104 014	1.3	55	3.8	1 708	5.6
Monroe -----	19	6.0	1 146	3.5	126	2.7	50 650	2.0	36	5.3	896	8.2
Montgomery -----	26	5.2	1 347	4.6	225	2.0	87 772	1.3	33	5.4	654	6.6
Morgan -----	9	10.2	166	6.6	199	2.0	94 103	1.3	46	4.6	2 622	3.2
Moultrie -----	49	4.8	917	5.9	75	3.5	25 748	2.8	21	6.8	332	10.7
Ogle -----	69	3.6	2 736	3.9	216	1.9	111 833	1.0	76	3.7	3 690	6.7
Peoria -----	18	7.7	605	7.3	107	2.7	34 861	2.2	54	4.4	1 193	5.3
Perry -----	12	9.6	551	9.4	100	3.7	16 501	4.4	16	9.0	308	10.6
Piatt -----	4	17.5	140	18.0	26	5.2	16 551	1.7	9	10.8	301	14.8
Pike -----	17	6.7	399	4.8	424	1.8	176 670	1.2	50	4.8	1 285	6.4
Pope -----	4	14.6	5	15.7	41	4.5	4 120	3.5	3	10.2	(D)	(D)
Pulaski -----	3	16.6	266	5.4	22	7.1	2 119	6.6	4	18.3	58	19.3
Putnam -----	6	12.6	152	12.3	40	5.1	14 433	3.5	7	10.7	341	20.9
Randolph -----	41	4.4	2 422	4.0	175	2.3	38 219	2.4	30	6.1	960	11.3
Richland -----	15	7.9	552	5.4	117	3.1	52 956	1.8	4	14.4	21	15.7
Rock Island -----	9	11.3	250	13.6	129	2.5	70 060	1.6	55	4.3	1 572	7.0
St. Clair -----	26	4.5	1 177	3.5	141	2.4	41 265	1.7	44	4.5	1 234	8.0
Saline -----	8	9.0	55	8.6	66	3.9	13 302	2.7	4	16.3	(D)	(D)
Sangamon -----	8	11.7	194	20.2	138	2.3	74 258	.8	52	4.4	1 522	5.8
Schuylerville -----	10	10.5	86	23.9	93	3.5	31 645	2.3	38	5.7	1 004	7.0
Scott -----	1	47.5	(D)	(D)	116	3.0	42 627	2.6	28	6.9	736	9.2
Shelby -----	37	3.8	2 132	3.0	233	2.2	71 518	1.6	26	5.8	803	6.6
Stark -----	4	13.4	121	16.7	63	3.0	31 308	2.5	12	7.3	383	11.2
Stephenson -----	408	1.9	25 500	1.5	262	2.1	120 732	1.4	91	3.6	3 388	5.0
Tazewell -----	28	5.3	854	4.8	146	2.0	109 534	1.0	65	3.4	1 346	3.9
Union -----	9	8.9	483	8.3	43	4.4	7 955	3.4	4	15.1	240	11.5
Vermilion -----	14	7.2	398	9.7	123	2.4	34 236	1.8	28	5.2	793	6.9
Wabash -----	4	10.1	393	4.3	38	4.1	12 515	2.3	3	21.0	95	27.8
Warren -----	11	9.0	358	11.2	203	1.8	90 369	1.0	83	3.1	4 075	4.1
Washington -----	102	2.6	7 953	2.1	158	2.3	74 365	1.4	15	7.7	294	9.1
Wayne -----	24	5.5	774	4.3	187	2.3	52 400	1.6	11	10.3	170	15.4
White -----	2	18.4	(D)	(D)	54	4.4	18 179	2.2	9	11.7	219	17.5
Whiteside -----	57	3.9	2 465	3.2	286	1.7	128 253	1.2	64	4.0	1 781	7.3
Will -----	38	4.5	1 428	3.9	62	3.7	31 222	2.0	28	6.0	410	8.2
Williamson -----	14	8.7	74	18.4	48	4.5	9 153	5.1	6	15.4	139	19.8
Winnebago -----	86	3.8	4 298	3.7	101	2.8	40 954	1.9	59	4.1	2 157	9.4
Woodford -----	34	4.8	950	4.3	166	2.0	97 829	1.1	84	2.9	3 194	8.8

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-27

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.							
	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois.....	2 222	1.3	3 874 406	.3	123	3.1	60 004	7.0
Adams.....	33	5.6	(D)	(D)	1	39.3	(D)	(D)
Alexander.....	8	10.0	149	9.2	—	—	—	—
Bond.....	16	9.5	444	14.2	2	21.3	(D)	(D)
Boone.....	21	7.7	1 478	11.0	—	—	—	—
Brown.....	13	7.7	602	3.9	—	—	—	—
Bureau.....	36	5.0	1 731	12.1	1	33.6	(D)	(D)
Calhoun.....	11	11.7	346	13.3	—	—	—	—
Carroll.....	21	6.8	(D)	(D)	5	11.5	436	16.7
Cass.....	7	10.5	501	7.9	—	—	—	—
Champaign.....	20	6.9	4 628	.8	1	33.1	(D)	(D)
Christian.....	12	10.9	347	15.3	—	—	—	—
Clark.....	22	8.3	1 332	24.2	—	—	—	—
Clay.....	28	5.9	973	9.7	—	—	—	—
Clinton.....	34	4.6	900 347	1.1	—	—	—	—
Coles.....	22	6.4	(D)	(D)	1	26.7	(D)	(D)
Cook.....	12	10.7	351	21.5	—	—	—	—
Crawford.....	15	10.6	351	13.7	—	—	—	—
Cumberland.....	19	7.1	445	9.6	—	—	—	—
De Kalb.....	18	6.5	(D)	(D)	1	36.2	(D)	(D)
De Witt.....	11	7.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Douglas.....	39	5.2	4 159	6.8	7	12.1	20 945	19.5
Du Page.....	4	16.8	39	23.1	—	—	—	—
Edgar.....	15	7.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Edwards.....	14	10.0	364	12.7	—	—	—	—
Effingham.....	40	4.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Fayette.....	49	5.5	(D)	(D)	2	21.4	(D)	(D)
Ford.....	15	7.7	560	14.5	—	—	—	—
Franklin.....	32	6.1	758	9.3	—	—	—	—
Fulton.....	41	5.3	973	6.7	2	25.3	(D)	(D)
Gallatin.....	3	14.9	14	12.8	—	—	—	—
Greene.....	32	5.9	899	7.0	1	44.2	(D)	(D)
Grundy.....	3	21.2	63	12.3	—	—	—	—
Hamilton.....	10	11.1	355	21.8	—	—	—	—
Hancock.....	27	6.4	1 696	9.7	—	—	—	—
Hardin.....	6	16.2	219	18.0	—	—	—	—
Henderson.....	12	9.7	2 216	19.2	—	—	—	—
Henry.....	30	6.2	2 093	11.8	7	11.4	506	13.4
Iroquois.....	24	5.7	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Jackson.....	27	6.5	478	7.5	—	—	—	—
Jasper.....	17	7.3	462	12.3	1	—	(D)	(D)
Jefferson.....	32	5.8	639	9.1	—	—	—	—
Jersey.....	33	6.5	1 185	8.0	—	—	—	—
Jo Daviess.....	33	5.5	1 004	6.2	6	11.7	775	19.9
Johnson.....	13	8.2	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Kane.....	21	7.1	1 621	21.9	4	17.9	159	19.9
Kankakee.....	24	7.2	(D)	(D)	2	16.1	(D)	(D)
Kendall.....	12	9.0	853	17.8	3	17.5	(D)	(D)
Knox.....	25	6.9	1 866	17.5	3	20.3	(D)	(D)
Lake.....	23	7.1	1 331	14.7	—	—	—	—
La Salle.....	33	5.8	644	8.0	—	—	—	—
Lawrence.....	6	12.1	127	18.2	—	—	—	—
Lee.....	17	7.5	(D)	(D)	5	12.2	540	15.5
Livingston.....	34	4.9	176 408	1.1	4	15.7	390	8.9
Logan.....	10	6.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
McDonough.....	17	7.6	516	8.3	—	—	—	—
McHenry.....	57	4.5	5 504	12.6	6	14.1	441	15.0
McLean.....	18	7.1	483	8.6	3	13.7	57	18.7
Macon.....	15	8.0	(D)	(D)	1	37.3	(D)	(D)
Macoupin.....	41	5.1	1 801	9.6	—	—	—	—
Madison.....	56	4.1	3 623	7.4	1	34.5	(D)	(D)
Marion.....	22	8.4	(D)	(D)	2	22.7	(D)	(D)
Marshall.....	4	15.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Mason.....	9	11.2	794	19.3	—	—	—	—
Massac.....	10	12.6	188	13.5	—	—	—	—
Menard.....	20	5.7	2 029	15.0	—	—	—	—
Mercer.....	19	7.3	447	9.5	1	35.8	(D)	(D)
Monroe.....	35	5.3	22 131	15.5	1	36.6	(D)	(D)
Montgomery.....	27	6.1	(D)	(D)	1	29.2	(D)	(D)
Morgan.....	21	7.9	535	9.7	1	45.2	(D)	(D)
Moultrie.....	22	7.4	(D)	(D)	2	25.1	(D)	(D)
Ogle.....	32	5.8	(D)	(D)	9	9.9	(D)	(D)
Peoria.....	13	8.8	317	10.5	1	31.6	(D)	(D)
Perry.....	25	7.1	1 390	11.3	—	—	—	—
Piatt.....	6	12.6	85	21.2	—	—	—	—
Pike.....	29	6.0	1 246	5.0	—	—	—	—
Pope.....	5	14.9	54	15.8	—	—	—	—
Pulaski.....	4	16.5	172	16.4	—	—	—	—
Putnam.....	9	11.4	915	10.2	—	—	—	—
Randolph.....	43	5.1	1 800	8.0	—	—	—	—

See footnotes at end of table.

C-28 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.											
	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory					Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold						
	Farms		Total			Farms		Total				
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number		
Richland -----	27	6.2	1 081	10.4	2	23.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)		
Rock Island -----	10	11.7	623	40.0	2	23.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)		
St. Clair -----	48	4.5	2 925	7.7	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)		
Saline -----	9	10.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Sangamon -----	30	5.7	(D)	(D)	1	36.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)		
Schuylerville -----	10	11.9	267	13.7	1	46.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)		
Scott -----	9	11.9	385	18.3	1	41.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)		
Shelby -----	40	5.5	4 339	15.1	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Stark -----	4	14.0	(D)	(D)	1	25.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)		
Stephenson -----	39	5.1	(D)	(D)	9	11.7	2 130	16.5	16.5	16.5		
Tazewell -----	23	6.2	(D)	(D)	1	36.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)		
Union -----	18	7.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Vermilion -----	23	5.9	852	8.5	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Wabash -----	5	12.8	100	19.0	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Warren -----	24	6.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Washington -----	36	5.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Wayne -----	28	5.4	591	5.9	—	—	—	—	—	—		
White -----	16	8.7	396	11.4	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Whiteside -----	28	6.4	(D)	(D)	8	11.4	1 911	17.8	17.8	17.8		
Will -----	23	7.5	969	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Williamson -----	19	7.0	497	10.3	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Winnebago -----	26	6.1	1 168	9.4	5	16.6	979	23.9	23.9	23.9		
Woodford -----	33	4.5	(D)	(D)	3	15.9	273	20.6	20.6	20.6		
Selected crops harvested												
Geographic area	Corn for grain or seed					Corn for silage or green chop						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Illinois -----	55 685	.9	10 770 985	.6	1 532 681 088	.6	5 005	.9	164 698	.8	2 659 536	.9
Adams -----	1 022	1.4	130 035	1.2	17 782 360	1.2	100	2.6	2 732	3.4	34 545	2.8
Alexander -----	80	2.4	11 253	1.4	1 556 077	1.2	4	16.0	50	15.5	1 190	15.9
Bond -----	359	2.3	36 676	2.2	4 778 458	2.2	78	4.3	1 857	4.7	28 275	5.0
Boone -----	331	1.6	67 018	1.4	8 255 549	1.4	90	3.2	2 978	4.1	43 688	3.5
Brown -----	241	1.1	34 531	1.0	4 628 365	1.0	14	6.0	334	4.4	7 137	4.0
Bureau -----	1 080	1.1	258 530	.9	35 818 997	.9	61	3.0	1 952	3.7	33 644	5.4
Calhoun -----	253	2.0	19 575	2.1	2 572 366	2.1	11	9.5	310	14.0	6 296	13.8
Carroll -----	515	1.1	133 260	.9	17 491 658	.9	182	1.7	7 493	1.9	123 221	2.2
Cass -----	321	1.1	81 986	.9	12 090 530	.9	6	5.2	284	16.3	3 990	11.6
Champaign -----	1 274	.9	278 159	.7	45 486 676	.7	22	5.4	1 923	7.1	32 798	9.1
Christian -----	728	1.2	175 230	.8	29 422 279	.8	9	6.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clark -----	505	1.8	93 749	1.4	14 688 566	1.4	21	8.3	637	10.4	10 045	10.7
Clay -----	410	1.9	56 753	1.6	6 028 137	1.5	16	5.8	894	3.7	16 833	7.2
Clinton -----	725	1.3	68 440	1.2	8 406 120	1.2	203	2.1	5 561	2.2	92 937	2.2
Coles -----	531	1.1	111 509	.9	17 672 756	.9	23	5.1	361	6.2	6 546	6.5
Cook -----	61	3.5	10 558	3.7	1 068 050	4.4	6	13.2	466	26.2	4 747	27.9
Crawford -----	397	1.8	81 458	1.2	11 567 230	1.1	12	8.6	220	8.9	3 645	8.5
Cumberland -----	500	1.4	67 220	1.3	10 175 081	1.3	50	3.2	1 542	2.4	27 791	2.5
De Kalb -----	785	.9	211 712	.6	28 270 633	.7	93	2.1	4 968	2.9	84 997	1.7
De Witt -----	411	1.2	97 072	1.0	14 524 803	1.0	11	7.6	410	20.1	6 272	19.7
Douglas -----	549	1.0	125 752	.7	20 883 386	.7	56	4.4	870	7.7	14 865	7.4
Du Page -----	26	5.0	7 768	2.7	797 479	3.3	2	21.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Edgar -----	644	1.3	154 471	.9	23 965 721	.9	22	5.4	1 514	8.6	33 376	9.4
Edwards -----	228	1.5	36 492	1.4	4 863 378	1.3	22	6.2	433	4.7	6 489	4.4
Effingham -----	819	1.6	82 668	1.7	10 435 368	1.7	142	2.6	4 073	2.3	60 316	2.4
Fayette -----	666	2.1	77 211	1.7	9 699 090	1.6	68	4.4	2 478	5.1	44 281	7.1
Ford -----	546	.9	138 274	.8	20 354 780	.8	9	3.8	468	1.5	9 753	1.1
Franklin -----	255	1.9	37 532	1.7	3 926 908	1.7	25	6.2	817	9.1	18 232	11.1
Fulton -----	831	1.4	136 118	1.1	18 969 816	1.1	45	3.9	1 282	4.9	20 470	4.8
Gallatin -----	176	1.6	70 458	.9	10 552 071	.9	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Greene -----	596	1.7	102 220	1.2	14 277 842	1.2	42	4.2	1 190	2.9	13 981	3.9
Grundy -----	457	2.0	112 238	1.5	16 222 650	1.5	8	11.4	262	12.5	4 862	11.8
Hamilton -----	277	1.7	55 787	1.3	6 766 607	1.2	5	15.6	198	22.5	2 056	21.9
Hancock -----	884	1.5	144 874	1.2	20 912 517	1.2	76	3.0	2 770	4.3	54 100	4.6
Hardin -----	19	7.3	2 022	4.2	235 247	4.7	2	23.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Henderson -----	382	1.2	92 847	1.1	12 845 065	1.1	29	3.5	1 534	3.8	21 753	2.9
Henry -----	1 160	1.1	235 585	.8	32 068 803	.8	131	2.1	4 093	2.5	61 232	2.7
Iroquois -----	1 356	1.1	311 765	.8	44 526 657	.8	62	3.0	2 603	4.5	46 056	5.4
Jackson -----	295	1.6	35 310	1.7	3 769 012	1.7	22	5.8	876	2.9	13 696	2.1
Jasper -----	579	1.6	85 027	1.3	11 923 165	1.3	45	3.6	1 832	3.5	29 297	3.8
Jefferson -----	415	1.9	41 720	1.5	3 787 450	1.5	29	6.0	1 005	9.8	13 020	10.3
Jersey -----	363	1.7	55 677	1.4	8 079 086	1.4	45	4.4	1 033	3.9	15 419	3.5
Jo Daviess -----	670	1.2	82 678	1.0	9 368 743	1.0	280	1.8	7 375	1.8	103 890	2.2
Johnson -----	91	3.3	10 202	3.0	1 087 091	3.0	9	11.0	260	8.6	2 695	10.4

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-29

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed								Corn for silage or green chop			
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Kane -----	440	1.3	102 365	1.0	12 328 593	1.0	74	2.8	2 686	3.4	45 390	4.3
Kankakee -----	752	1.2	182 399	1.0	24 303 166	1.0	39	4.8	777	6.0	11 046	5.9
Kendall -----	390	1.0	88 996	.9	12 312 186	.9	30	4.1	1 150	4.0	18 102	2.6
Knox -----	772	1.2	151 798	.9	21 967 613	.9	44	3.7	1 003	4.8	16 222	5.5
Lake -----	104	2.5	20 344	1.7	1 841 779	1.5	18	6.9	951	3.0	10 560	3.7
La Salle -----	1 416	1.2	287 432	1.0	42 403 608	.9	71	3.1	4 090	4.3	81 512	5.4
Lawrence -----	250	1.8	68 863	1.1	9 549 610	1.0	13	7.4	677	5.8	10 056	7.1
Lee -----	864	1.2	225 260	.9	32 353 349	.9	66	2.3	2 382	2.3	39 179	2.3
Livingston -----	1 391	.9	293 896	.8	43 905 431	.8	55	3.7	2 807	9.1	66 524	11.8
Logan -----	723	1.2	175 295	.9	27 406 563	.9	11	5.2	386	4.6	4 998	6.5
McDonough -----	660	1.5	133 566	1.2	20 296 253	1.1	36	4.0	2 059	5.8	41 332	4.9
McHenry -----	517	1.5	108 536	1.3	12 410 856	1.3	165	2.4	5 380	2.1	79 281	2.1
McLean -----	1 382	.9	331 888	.7	51 671 510	.7	48	4.4	1 824	7.2	33 282	7.9
Macon -----	589	.9	145 558	.7	25 006 618	.7	3	16.2	50	19.5	900	21.6
Macoupin -----	917	1.5	137 074	1.3	21 136 563	1.2	95	2.7	2 817	5.6	46 916	5.3
Madison -----	750	1.2	82 016	1.2	11 612 024	1.1	98	2.9	2 462	3.2	38 802	3.0
Marion -----	441	2.0	44 767	1.9	4 916 645	1.9	33	6.4	905	6.9	12 297	6.1
Marshall -----	435	1.2	86 775	1.1	12 809 123	1.1	14	5.5	323	6.3	4 430	4.1
Mason -----	407	1.2	111 799	.9	16 122 793	.9	4	—	410	—	8 020	—
Massac -----	178	2.7	23 568	2.8	2 801 028	2.8	9	7.7	457	1.1	5 560	.3
Menard -----	258	1.3	67 358	1.0	10 411 084	1.0	12	5.5	236	3.2	3 094	4.4
Mercer -----	590	1.3	137 717	1.0	18 805 430	1.0	37	3.9	799	5.9	11 955	6.0
Monroe -----	318	1.6	41 644	1.2	5 160 163	1.2	25	5.0	1 051	3.7	17 684	4.3
Montgomery -----	826	1.7	136 243	1.4	20 976 118	1.4	48	3.4	1 709	6.5	35 367	7.0
Morgan -----	647	1.3	121 830	1.0	18 251 974	1.0	29	3.6	1 346	1.9	18 563	2.4
Moultrie -----	401	1.1	84 971	.9	14 715 916	.9	38	5.2	452	5.2	7 832	6.0
Ogle -----	899	1.2	214 800	.9	27 944 880	.9	163	2.0	5 158	1.6	82 501	1.8
Peoria -----	679	1.2	108 255	1.1	15 066 314	1.1	24	6.0	856	5.9	13 462	8.2
Perry -----	355	1.9	42 501	2.1	3 804 738	2.0	39	5.8	827	4.8	11 015	4.4
Piatt -----	451	1.0	117 130	.8	19 869 505	.8	19	6.8	452	10.4	11 985	12.4
Pike -----	737	1.4	123 507	.9	17 163 919	.8	53	3.7	1 803	3.6	24 137	3.2
Pope -----	78	3.2	6 462	2.8	679 464	2.9	3	18.3	90	16.6	950	15.8
Pulaski -----	82	2.7	17 178	1.7	2 365 531	1.7	5	5.0	280	6.1	5 557	6.1
Putnam -----	167	1.8	34 505	2.0	4 896 003	2.1	11	9.1	324	16.0	5 300	19.0
Randolph -----	587	1.5	55 867	1.3	6 179 582	1.2	71	3.4	1 728	3.2	25 029	3.6
Richland -----	398	1.7	64 949	1.3	8 115 862	1.3	32	5.5	888	7.0	15 422	9.0
Rock Island -----	435	1.3	73 607	1.1	9 793 064	1.1	30	5.8	546	6.4	9 215	6.1
St. Clair -----	652	1.3	80 417	1.2	11 176 653	1.2	42	3.9	946	4.7	16 778	5.3
Saline -----	245	1.9	46 651	1.5	5 801 779	1.5	7	13.2	540	16.4	7 964	16.5
Sangamon -----	751	1.0	197 651	.7	32 314 473	.7	23	6.0	1 862	11.6	26 468	13.9
Schuyler -----	366	1.8	51 803	1.4	7 208 862	1.4	12	9.9	285	10.7	4 711	11.8
Scott -----	251	1.9	46 134	1.5	6 930 900	1.5	7	10.1	294	21.1	3 754	24.8
Shelby -----	1 000	1.5	157 026	1.1	24 204 809	1.1	94	3.1	2 929	3.7	54 733	4.2
Stark -----	309	1.3	85 985	1.0	12 562 043	1.0	16	6.7	185	7.4	2 832	9.0
Stephenson -----	919	1.5	151 696	1.1	18 121 255	1.1	396	1.9	10 260	1.5	150 667	1.6
Tazewell -----	771	.9	153 974	.8	23 987 451	.8	24	4.4	641	3.8	10 035	3.1
Union -----	137	2.4	12 578	1.9	1 524 173	1.9	6	11.0	285	7.2	2 470	11.7
Vermilion -----	864	1.2	221 793	.9	34 909 100	.9	30	4.0	1 349	7.8	25 626	10.6
Wabash -----	181	1.2	45 931	1.1	6 463 905	1.1	11	7.6	251	6.9	3 496	4.8
Warren -----	664	1.2	150 521	.9	22 182 403	.9	45	3.6	1 502	5.4	24 794	6.2
Washington -----	639	1.3	78 521	1.1	8 638 065	1.1	150	2.3	4 982	2.4	65 112	2.6
Wayne -----	561	1.5	83 554	1.1	9 364 302	1.1	50	3.3	1 434	2.9	18 677	3.3
White -----	302	1.5	79 501	.8	10 935 763	.9	7	12.9	72	7.9	854	9.9
Whiteside -----	891	1.1	224 053	.8	31 388 948	.8	132	2.0	5 091	2.4	84 407	3.8
Will -----	705	1.4	144 035	1.1	18 507 438	1.2	44	4.1	1 041	5.5	20 231	7.2
Williamson -----	169	2.2	16 990	2.2	1 796 125	2.6	11	9.1	234	11.8	3 497	12.5
Winnebago -----	478	1.7	100 284	1.6	11 585 891	1.6	124	2.7	4 633	2.9	67 957	3.5
Woodford -----	731	1.0	131 748	.9	19 119 269	.9	20	6.2	823	13.5	13 615	14.5
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Wheat for grain						Soybeans for beans					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois-----	17 061	1.0	1 075 805	.8	54 096 203	.8	52 339	.9	8 932 399	.6	373 563 650	.6
Adams-----	715	1.4	32 008	1.3	1 477 780	1.3	1 013	1.4	119 739	1.2	4 578 518	1.2
Alexander-----	31	4.3	3 005	4.6	154 510	4.5	91	2.2	35 837	1.6	1 280 048	1.6
Bond-----	364	2.3	35 174	2.3	1 950 236	2.2	404	2.2	62 273	2.3	2 156 889	2.3
Boone-----	11	9.2	145	9.3	5 276	8.9	279	1.7	35 158	1.6	1 422 128	1.7
Brown-----	159	1.5	7 728	1.2	355 024	1.4	225	1.2	28 230	1.0	1 106 765	1.0
Bureau-----	38	3.9	1 028	3.8	39 131	3.6	975	1.2	140 086	1.0	5 890 798	1.0
Calhoun-----	132	2.6	5 325	2.2	267 572	2.1	181	2.4	11 839	2.1	490 253	2.1
Carroll-----	8	10.2	192	14.1	7 572	11.3	239	1.6	19 557	1.6	884 303	1.6
Cass-----	127	2.0	4 890	1.9	206 148	2.0	322	1.1	66 679	1.0	2 662 073	.9

See footnotes at end of table.

C-30 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Wheat for grain								Soybeans for beans			
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Champaign-----	42	3.8	1 280	3.6	64 069	4.1	1 260	.9	246 677	.7	11 434 033	.7
Christian-----	194	1.9	6 400	2.2	372 568	2.1	670	1.2	169 850	.8	8 036 535	.7
Clark-----	217	2.5	11 474	2.1	543 574	2.2	502	1.8	91 915	1.5	3 696 628	1.5
Clay-----	375	2.1	33 813	1.9	1 596 286	1.8	485	1.8	82 005	1.6	2 477 512	1.6
Clinton-----	657	1.3	37 635	1.3	2 029 431	1.3	697	1.3	71 982	1.3	2 506 435	1.3
Coles-----	124	2.3	4 228	2.3	200 198	2.3	510	1.1	101 818	.9	4 557 452	.9
Cook-----	6	12.3	178	22.8	5 937	25.9	65	3.2	10 949	2.8	375 912	3.2
Crawford-----	208	1.8	17 006	1.4	782 549	1.5	404	1.7	82 865	1.3	3 343 542	1.2
Cumberland-----	263	1.6	9 387	2.0	481 767	2.0	490	1.4	64 324	1.5	2 700 085	1.5
De Kalb-----	14	5.0	578	2.8	29 118	2.9	735	.9	113 384	.8	4 927 795	.8
De Witt-----	24	5.5	858	11.5	33 923	12.1	393	1.3	89 094	1.1	3 913 003	1.0
Douglas-----	24	4.9	658	2.7	36 383	2.6	513	1.0	110 615	.8	5 171 279	.8
Du Page-----	3	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	30	4.4	5 914	3.1	214 844	3.4
Edgar-----	100	2.8	3 183	2.6	156 805	2.6	630	1.3	141 189	.9	6 155 265	.9
Edwards-----	172	1.8	11 755	1.8	534 290	1.8	212	1.7	31 702	1.5	1 258 759	1.5
Effingham-----	645	1.8	26 672	1.8	1 419 017	1.9	811	1.6	81 855	1.7	2 990 332	1.7
Fayette-----	593	2.1	43 248	2.0	2 308 894	1.9	715	2.0	105 960	1.8	3 872 485	1.7
Ford-----	5	8.3	260	8.0	13 400	7.6	545	.9	133 119	.7	6 001 359	.8
Franklin-----	147	2.4	11 733	1.9	549 472	1.6	299	1.8	57 360	1.5	1 801 742	1.5
Fulton-----	260	1.9	10 665	2.1	499 572	2.4	794	1.3	112 823	1.0	4 631 620	1.1
Gallatin-----	84	2.3	10 429	1.2	585 823	1.0	175	1.7	57 637	1.1	2 308 952	1.1
Greene-----	348	1.8	16 917	1.7	911 911	1.8	546	1.7	87 251	1.2	3 618 928	1.2
Grundy-----	15	7.3	508	3.9	23 879	4.1	422	2.1	86 305	1.6	3 690 231	1.6
Hamilton-----	178	2.0	18 813	1.6	869 000	1.4	313	1.7	65 413	1.3	2 274 818	1.2
Hancock-----	351	1.8	12 939	1.8	540 636	1.8	874	1.4	138 871	1.2	5 873 371	1.2
Hardin-----	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	15	7.5	1 632	6.6	51 159	5.9
Henderson-----	19	6.1	935	11.6	40 488	14.3	323	1.3	47 288	1.3	2 012 805	1.3
Henry-----	19	5.0	569	3.3	25 874	3.4	994	1.1	112 518	.9	4 890 972	.9
Iroquois-----	40	3.7	1 613	5.2	71 630	3.3	1 316	1.1	268 316	.8	11 705 945	.8
Jackson-----	230	1.8	16 560	1.6	824 069	1.6	302	1.6	52 982	1.3	1 852 887	1.4
Jasper-----	408	1.6	21 672	1.6	1 123 366	1.6	611	1.5	102 686	1.3	4 275 540	1.2
Jefferson-----	282	2.2	17 637	1.8	761 690	1.7	450	1.8	63 528	1.7	1 908 395	1.6
Jersey-----	270	1.8	18 628	1.5	1 008 013	1.5	363	1.7	47 583	1.4	2 035 721	1.3
Jo Daviess-----	7	11.8	112	11.9	5 058	11.0	144	2.4	9 165	2.1	320 929	2.1
Johnson-----	26	6.0	1 677	7.3	82 315	7.4	66	3.9	8 712	3.5	295 181	3.3
Kane-----	24	5.1	1 178	9.6	45 610	9.3	411	1.3	60 513	1.2	2 438 976	1.1
Kankakee-----	35	4.9	1 044	5.6	46 477	6.3	722	1.2	129 159	1.1	5 313 886	1.0
Kendall-----	13	5.7	359	4.8	15 810	3.7	378	1.0	62 566	1.1	2 727 086	1.1
Knox-----	78	3.1	2 052	2.5	99 377	2.3	688	1.3	110 898	.9	4 957 706	.9
Lake-----	18	5.9	2 094	2.0	72 074	1.6	101	2.5	21 951	1.5	651 635	1.5
La Salle-----	21	5.7	939	6.2	44 581	6.7	1 381	1.2	243 328	1.0	10 688 999	.9
Lawrence-----	171	2.0	17 324	1.5	809 768	1.5	256	1.7	56 163	1.2	2 249 464	1.1
Lee-----	16	6.4	546	3.8	27 007	3.1	788	1.2	124 022	1.1	5 311 883	1.0
Livingston-----	29	5.3	544	4.3	24 570	3.8	1 366	1.0	283 573	.8	12 556 734	.8
Logan-----	41	4.0	1 726	3.0	62 548	5.1	712	1.2	155 517	1.0	6 961 342	1.0
McDonough-----	112	2.8	3 623	2.4	148 291	2.7	644	1.5	121 120	1.2	5 267 348	1.1
McHenry-----	31	5.2	1 265	6.1	43 849	5.9	391	1.6	54 081	1.4	2 073 761	1.4
McLean-----	17	7.3	771	7.6	26 477	10.2	1 339	1.0	301 060	.7	13 995 756	.7
Macon-----	24	6.2	777	5.6	32 100	6.3	572	.9	136 984	.7	6 500 970	.7
Macoupin-----	529	1.6	26 132	1.6	1 445 650	1.6	907	1.5	134 709	1.3	5 745 426	1.2
Madison-----	704	1.2	55 745	1.2	2 991 987	1.2	787	1.2	99 758	1.2	3 935 201	1.1
Marion-----	410	2.1	33 308	1.9	1 693 666	1.9	543	1.8	78 729	1.8	2 626 138	1.9
Marshall-----	52	3.8	2 342	3.4	68 882	4.8	412	1.2	70 630	1.1	3 048 295	1.2
Mason-----	103	2.6	4 197	3.0	166 692	3.3	402	1.2	86 603	1.0	3 495 617	1.0
Massac-----	52	4.9	2 713	4.0	124 663	4.5	167	2.8	24 541	2.5	861 790	2.7
Menard-----	70	2.5	2 601	1.9	150 424	2.0	252	1.4	60 542	1.0	2 663 034	1.0
Mercer-----	38	4.2	1 003	4.9	38 312	5.1	545	1.4	89 504	1.0	3 897 156	1.0
Monroe-----	365	1.5	40 789	1.3	2 161 491	1.3	369	1.5	49 233	1.2	1 833 569	1.3
Montgomery-----	489	1.8	29 390	1.5	1 709 608	1.5	832	1.6	135 029	1.4	5 611 065	1.4
Morgan-----	209	2.0	6 695	2.2	375 643	2.6	607	1.3	107 310	1.0	4 794 416	1.0
Moultrie-----	69	3.3	1 823	3.2	100 622	3.3	379	1.1	78 519	1.0	3 744 526	1.0
Ogle-----	23	5.6	960	11.3	53 094	12.0	683	1.4	77 427	1.1	3 408 140	1.1
Peoria-----	123	2.7	4 111	5.0	141 516	5.4	612	1.3	83 809	1.2	3 530 399	1.1
Perry-----	290	2.2	19 348	2.3	871 591	2.4	373	1.9	50 726	2.1	1 484 609	2.1
Piatt-----	12	7.9	1 313	2.2	53 666	1.6	443	1.0	111 157	.8	5 257 995	.8
Pike-----	419	1.7	27 700	1.2	1 506 450	1.2	654	1.6	98 757	1.0	3 768 812	.9
Pope-----	18	6.6	786	14.0	26 392	12.7	61	3.6	6 353	3.5	198 051	3.5
Pulaski-----	63	3.3	4 883	2.7	242 786	2.6	121	2.7	32 874	1.5	1 196 354	1.5
Putnam-----	16	8.2	387	10.9	15 659	14.3	153	2.0	25 427	2.2	1 180 225	2.2
Randolph-----	540	1.4	41 385	1.3	2 026 298	1.2	589	1.4	66 603	1.3	2 150 558	1.3
Richland-----	300	1.8	19 888	1.7	987 868	1.7	402	1.6	68 936	1.4	2 565 101	1.3
Rock Island-----	17	4.6	663	2.8	28 928	1.7	337	1.4	41 762	1.4	1 805 321	1.3
St. Clair-----	619	1.3	50 672	1.4	2 744 717	1.4	684	1.3	93 291	1.2	3 647 615	1.2
Saline-----	116	2.8	8 431	2.7	408 742	2.3	228	1.9	45 358	1.7	1 733 611	1.6
Sangamon-----	95	2.8	3 198	3.5	179 767	3.5	733	1.0	184 145	.7	8 892 090	.7
Schuylerville-----	232	2.2	11 207	1.9	507 761	2.0	343	1.9	48 969	1.4	1 909 891	1.4
Scott-----	113	2.9	5 547	2.6	309 933	2.8	229	2.0	36 373	1.5	1 493 881	1.6
Shelby-----	543	1.6	22 290	1.6	1 223 357	1.6	945	1.5	144 061	1.1	6 093 881	1.1
Stark-----	12	6.7	408	10.2	20 045	12.9	282	1.4	60 446	1.2	2 604 176	1.2
Stephenson-----	12	7.3	336	7.7	16 824	8.8	417	1.9	32 320	1.7	1 360 300	1.7

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-31

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Wheat for grain							Soybeans for beans				
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Tazewell -----	93	2.5	2 513	2.8	107 951	2.8	736	.9	121 425	.8	5 513 775	.8
Union -----	63	3.2	4 332	2.0	184 001	2.5	122	2.6	23 318	1.8	730 851	2.0
Vermilion -----	75	2.9	2 233	2.7	99 868	2.5	846	1.2	207 021	.9	9 112 330	.9
Wabash -----	115	1.8	10 713	1.6	530 685	1.6	174	1.2	43 223	1.1	1 737 527	1.2
Warren -----	20	5.2	494	4.2	21 957	4.1	603	1.2	94 742	1.1	4 400 522	1.0
Washington -----	627	1.2	60 175	1.1	3 060 936	1.1	673	1.2	105 487	1.1	3 343 813	1.1
Wayne -----	415	1.8	31 435	1.4	1 355 349	1.5	634	1.6	112 559	1.3	3 747 492	1.2
White -----	214	1.7	31 145	1.0	1 497 923	1.0	293	1.5	81 899	.8	3 270 134	.7
Whiteside -----	32	4.8	1 250	3.4	66 413	3.2	690	1.2	81 229	1.1	3 524 628	1.1
Will -----	45	4.3	1 868	5.4	71 847	6.3	699	1.5	125 298	1.2	4 997 784	1.2
Williamson -----	46	4.0	1 718	3.9	71 963	3.8	134	2.3	19 180	2.5	566 148	2.5
Winnebago -----	26	5.3	1 318	11.6	34 326	9.4	369	2.0	41 306	1.7	1 596 108	1.7
Woodford -----	71	3.4	2 448	3.9	100 377	3.3	723	1.0	116 191	.9	5 138 433	.9
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)							Vegetables harvested for sale				
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Illinois-----	27 481	.9	902 899	.8	2 463 316	.8	1 714	1.0	99 422	.8		
Adams -----	676	1.4	22 811	1.5	59 066	1.7	9	10.4	194	5.1		
Alexander -----	62	3.3	2 722	5.0	3 202	5.9	4	14.1	(D)	(D)		
Bond -----	253	2.5	8 588	3.5	22 961	3.8	4	15.4	18	17.1		
Boone -----	232	1.9	8 594	2.6	26 786	2.6	45	4.8	2 776	5.0		
Brown -----	182	1.5	5 661	1.9	14 148	1.5	2	18.3	(D)	(D)		
Bureau -----	353	1.5	8 526	2.8	24 804	2.6	23	6.1	933	9.9		
Calhoun -----	222	2.1	4 766	2.7	10 696	2.8	9	10.8	90	15.4		
Carroll -----	371	1.2	16 991	1.7	58 682	1.9	8	11.7	480	21.1		
Cass -----	149	1.9	3 747	2.0	10 755	2.3	10	8.6	169	7.1		
Champaign -----	219	1.9	4 200	2.5	13 888	2.3	15	6.9	216	11.5		
Christian -----	182	2.2	3 012	2.3	7 859	2.3	8	11.1	27	14.2		
Clark -----	180	2.8	3 567	3.0	8 215	3.2	3	—	343	—		
Clay -----	198	2.3	6 519	3.5	12 074	3.3	4	15.6	17	16.8		
Clinton -----	474	1.4	22 644	1.5	81 497	1.6	3	16.5	9	21.3		
Coles -----	168	2.1	4 404	5.4	12 627	3.0	9	9.6	35	11.3		
Cook -----	65	3.9	5 036	4.1	14 337	3.2	26	6.4	1 233	3.0		
Crawford -----	135	2.9	3 861	3.2	7 790	3.3	11	8.7	623	7.5		
Cumberland -----	185	2.1	4 959	2.1	13 988	2.0	6	12.6	37	22.8		
De Kalb -----	250	1.5	6 376	2.8	21 332	3.1	128	2.0	8 316	2.8		
De Witt -----	113	2.5	1 670	3.0	4 731	4.5	1	26.3	(D)	(D)		
Douglas -----	185	2.2	3 924	3.3	13 301	3.3	5	15.6	(D)	(D)		
Du Page -----	20	6.3	705	9.3	1 451	12.2	3	18.0	(D)	(D)		
Edgar -----	227	1.9	5 315	2.9	13 438	2.8	6	13.2	57	25.9		
Edwards -----	153	1.9	4 971	2.2	11 001	2.6	—	—	—	—		
Effingham -----	464	1.6	11 480	1.9	26 537	2.1	6	14.1	27	21.5		
Fayette -----	411	2.4	13 203	2.5	27 616	2.5	2	23.9	(D)	(D)		
Ford -----	107	2.3	2 543	1.9	7 356	1.7	11	7.7	368	3.5		
Franklin -----	203	2.2	5 950	3.6	11 699	4.1	3	26.4	6	25.8		
Fulton -----	530	1.5	14 794	1.8	45 852	1.9	8	12.2	29	24.2		
Gallatin -----	51	3.7	2 105	3.5	4 382	4.6	14	5.6	1 400	1.2		
Greene -----	299	2.0	8 021	2.4	22 987	2.6	7	14.9	66	27.0		
Grundy -----	109	3.1	2 292	3.4	6 004	4.1	6	14.4	55	27.9		
Hamilton -----	118	2.7	3 898	3.7	8 596	4.8	3	21.3	12	23.0		
Hancock -----	515	1.6	14 456	1.8	37 948	1.9	7	11.8	32	13.0		
Hardin -----	105	2.5	5 641	3.5	9 066	4.9	2	24.8	(D)	(D)		
Henderson -----	194	1.7	7 154	1.7	21 152	1.9	6	9.7	68	2.5		
Henry -----	564	1.3	15 513	1.5	51 116	1.6	19	6.8	237	8.2		
Iroquois -----	356	1.5	8 265	1.7	25 004	1.7	51	3.2	3 385	1.7		
Jackson -----	332	1.6	13 731	2.3	28 965	2.2	15	7.8	275	13.9		
Jasper -----	217	2.0	7 280	2.5	16 186	2.9	1	30.5	(D)	(D)		
Jefferson -----	388	1.7	14 113	2.3	28 109	2.7	16	8.0	129	10.3		
Jersey -----	204	2.1	5 524	2.3	15 606	2.6	8	12.4	39	17.3		
Jo Daviess -----	721	1.1	53 837	1.1	166 611	1.2	6	13.6	66	2.6		
Johnson -----	252	1.7	13 005	2.6	23 230	2.9	7	13.2	53	18.8		
Kane -----	230	1.9	8 064	2.3	25 475	2.5	28	5.0	1 625	2.3		
Kankakee -----	196	2.3	4 291	2.7	10 604	3.3	44	3.8	4 188	2.8		
Kendall -----	132	2.2	3 129	3.0	7 393	3.5	7	7.5	(D)	(D)		
Knox -----	491	1.3	15 369	1.4	49 144	1.4	6	14.5	13	16.5		
Lake -----	158	2.2	5 832	5.0	12 715	5.0	18	7.6	897	3.3		
La Salle -----	374	1.6	8 214	2.3	21 666	2.7	93	2.9	8 049	2.6		
Lawrence -----	92	2.9	2 431	3.7	5 684	3.9	10	4.1	834	.4		
Lee -----	260	1.8	6 499	2.1	18 530	1.9	94	2.8	8 949	2.5		
Livingston -----	311	1.6	6 755	2.0	20 955	2.2	7	11.6	575	15.6		
Logan -----	183	2.0	3 477	2.2	10 449	2.0	4	13.7	54	13.6		

See footnotes at end of table.

C-32 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.									
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						Vegetables harvested for sale			
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
McDonough -----	379	1.5	9 705	1.9	29 523	2.1	2	17.4	(D)	(D)
McHenry -----	458	1.5	19 276	2.0	53 351	1.9	81	3.4	9 012	2.5
McLean -----	321	1.7	7 793	1.8	22 966	1.7	9	9.3	87	16.5
Macon -----	116	2.5	1 809	3.3	5 522	3.7	12	9.5	130	14.9
Macoupin -----	446	1.5	10 743	1.7	29 751	2.0	9	10.4	19	14.0
Madison -----	549	1.4	15 376	1.7	48 906	1.8	36	4.7	1 690	3.9
Marion -----	313	2.3	10 538	3.2	21 221	3.7	12	10.6	81	29.1
Marshall -----	178	2.0	6 038	2.7	19 605	2.9	17	6.8	1 684	3.3
Mason -----	108	2.8	3 321	4.0	8 816	4.7	60	3.0	6 634	2.7
Massac -----	204	2.5	7 903	3.4	17 902	3.3	5	18.2	68	22.6
Menard -----	154	1.9	4 222	2.8	13 472	3.7	5	12.2	65	14.3
Mercer -----	356	1.5	11 357	1.8	36 448	1.8	8	10.3	122	3.1
Monroe -----	206	2.0	6 495	2.3	16 697	2.8	11	8.7	317	2.5
Montgomery -----	325	1.7	7 973	2.0	21 315	2.2	—	—	—	—
Morgan -----	306	1.6	5 949	1.8	18 447	2.2	11	11.9	39	15.1
Moultrie -----	146	2.4	2 900	3.0	8 574	3.5	4	17.5	20	21.4
Ogle -----	491	1.4	16 894	1.5	54 041	1.6	86	2.9	6 945	3.2
Peoria -----	429	1.5	9 605	2.0	28 133	2.4	25	5.5	963	6.2
Perry -----	228	2.4	9 277	3.5	17 431	4.4	5	14.4	97	18.2
Piatt -----	76	3.0	1 293	3.5	4 257	3.3	8	11.2	45	14.8
Pike -----	481	1.6	18 672	1.7	53 027	1.8	5	12.1	70	17.2
Pope -----	146	1.7	7 242	2.5	11 041	2.4	3	16.7	13	13.6
Pulaski -----	89	3.0	5 044	4.8	10 099	4.5	9	11.0	192	7.4
Putnam -----	70	3.7	1 406	5.1	4 145	5.4	5	18.0	31	19.6
Randolph -----	464	1.4	17 137	1.6	38 798	1.8	5	13.5	8	12.3
Richland -----	148	2.5	3 745	3.3	8 039	3.8	4	13.2	6	8.6
Rock Island -----	318	1.5	8 816	2.3	27 088	2.5	11	8.8	48	11.6
St. Clair -----	269	1.8	6 082	2.4	17 022	2.4	33	5.4	646	4.1
Saline -----	143	2.6	5 831	3.3	11 017	3.1	7	10.3	33	15.6
Sangamon -----	278	1.8	6 029	2.2	16 339	2.3	13	8.6	67	10.8
Schuyler -----	260	2.1	8 124	2.5	21 684	2.8	3	19.3	11	27.5
Scott -----	135	2.7	3 066	3.1	8 810	4.3	2	31.4	(D)	(D)
Shelby -----	453	1.9	9 730	2.4	25 895	2.6	5	12.8	31	5.7
Stark -----	91	2.5	2 183	3.1	6 496	3.4	—	—	—	—
Stephenson -----	802	1.5	56 101	1.5	174 015	1.5	18	7.8	1 478	9.2
Tazewell -----	285	1.5	6 306	2.0	19 776	2.0	70	2.8	6 655	1.9
Union -----	302	1.4	14 747	2.5	25 185	2.3	38	5.2	644	4.0
Vermilion -----	242	1.7	4 892	3.1	13 723	4.3	47	3.8	1 735	3.6
Wabash -----	66	2.8	2 414	3.2	5 624	4.9	3	16.4	(D)	(D)
Warren -----	342	1.5	9 836	1.9	30 121	1.9	3	14.9	21	11.4
Washington -----	348	1.6	17 398	1.8	49 928	1.9	6	12.4	10	12.0
Wayne -----	330	1.7	13 317	1.9	26 888	2.3	12	8.3	12	13.6
White -----	115	3.4	4 179	3.4	8 039	3.6	10	10.6	902	3.6
Whiteside -----	428	1.3	12 223	1.4	38 568	1.6	40	4.2	5 072	3.1
Will -----	330	1.9	8 861	2.4	21 491	2.4	39	4.8	3 669	1.9
Williamson -----	279	1.5	8 922	2.4	14 768	2.8	11	9.3	91	9.9
Winnebago -----	368	1.8	14 962	2.5	43 084	2.3	37	5.0	1 498	6.1
Woodford -----	289	1.4	6 732	2.6	20 962	3.2	18	9.0	413	11.7

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

**Table G. State Estimates of the Not on the Mail List Component of Farm Coverage Error:
1992**

[Detail may not add to total due to rounding. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Census published farms		Not on mail list ¹		Percent not on mail list ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent
Farms ----- number	77 610	1.1	3 700	28.3	4.6	1.3
Land in farms ----- acres	27 250 340	.8	274 466	29.3	1.0	.3
Average size of farm ----- acres	351.1	.4	74.2	28.0	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres -----	5 026	1.3	598	60.9	10.6	5.9
10 to 49 acres -----	12 191	1.1	1 587	40.1	11.5	4.3
Less than 50 acres -----	17 217	1.1	2 185	39.9	11.3	4.2
50 acres or more -----	60 393	1.1	1 516	35.6	2.4	.9
50 to 99 acres -----	9 114	1.2	868	55.0	8.7	4.4
100 to 179 acres -----	11 125	1.4	266	70.9	2.3	1.7
180 acres or more -----	40 184	1.1	381	48.6	.9	.5
Harvested cropland ----- farms	69 425	1.1	3 073	31.9	4.2	1.4
acres	21 868 287	.8	131 353	33.0	.6	.2
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than \$1,000 -----	4 134	1.3	1 097	52.6	21.0	8.7
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----	5 044	1.2	1 441	43.2	22.2	7.5
Less than \$2,500 -----	9 178	1.2	2 537	39.2	21.7	6.6
\$2,500 or more -----	68 432	1.1	1 163	34.5	1.7	.6
\$2,500 to \$9,999 -----	12 511	1.1	631	53.2	4.8	2.4
\$10,000 or more -----	55 921	1.2	532	41.4	.9	.4
Market value of agricultural products sold ---\$1,000 ---	7 336 864	.7	37 839	39.0	.5	.2
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01) -----	54 697	1.1	1 891	34.5	3.3	1.1
Livestock (02) -----	22 913	1.0	1 809	35.3	7.3	2.6
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family -----	65 752	1.0	3 131	27.9	4.5	1.3
Partnership or corporation -----	11 358	1.3	270	67.6	2.3	1.5
Other -----	500	2.0	299	98.4	37.4	23.7
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners -----	34 158	1.1	3 051	27.4	8.2	2.2
Part owners and tenants -----	43 452	1.1	650	54.4	1.5	.8
Part owners -----	29 217	1.0	380	79.2	1.3	1.0
Tenants -----	14 235	1.5	269	68.6	1.9	1.3
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated -----	55 586	1.0	2 564	32.8	4.4	1.5
Not on farm operated -----	17 643	1.5	836	49.9	4.5	2.2
Not reported -----	4 381	1.1	301	61.9	6.4	3.7
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming -----	47 875	1.0	553	44.3	1.1	.5
Other -----	29 735	1.2	3 147	32.4	9.6	3.1
Operators by sex:						
Male -----	73 985	1.1	3 566	29.0	4.6	1.4
Female -----	3 625	1.4	134	96.9	3.6	3.3
Operators by race:						
White -----	77 391	1.1	3 401	26.4	4.2	1.2
Black and other races -----	219	2.5	-	(X)	(X)	(X)
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less -----	7 466	2.1	803	44.7	9.7	3.9
5 years or more -----	58 450	1.0	1 923	36.4	3.2	1.2
Average years on present farm -----	21.3	.3	8.4	35.3	(X)	(X)
Not reported -----	11 694	1.2	975	50.8	7.7	3.8
Average age of operator -----	51.7	.1	47.1	26.5	(X)	(X)

NOTE: These estimates do not account for incorrectly classified farms or farms appearing more than once in the census and are subject to change in the 1992 Coverage Evaluation publication. See appendix C text for further explanation.

¹Estimates are based on a sample survey conducted independently of census data collection.